WITHDRAWN

ACCESSION NUMBER 58048

SHELF NUMBER HT 421 A5 8th

The Virginia Library

McCormick Theological Seminary

of the

Presbyterian Church, Chicago

825 Belden Avenue

From

Received Jan. 1928

CONFERENCE DELEGATES CAME FROM TWENTY-SIX STATES AND CANADA. SEVENTY-SIX PER CENT. CAME FROM STATES TOUCHED BY AND INCLUDED IN THE THREE HUNDRED MILE RADIUS.

# NEEDED READJUSTMENTS IN RURAL LIFE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
EIGHTH NATIONAL COUNTRY
LIFE CONFERENCE

American country life conferenc

Richmond, Virginia

1925

WITHDRAWN

PUBLISHED BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
FOR THE
AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION
HENRY ISRAEL, *Executive Secretary*
1849 Grand Central Terminal
New York City

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY,
CHICAGO

Copyright, 1926
By the American Country Life Association

All Rights Reserved

Published, July, 1926

Composed and Printed by
J. J. Little & Ives Company
New York, U. S. A.

4 C
A5

# FOREWORD

This volume is the eighth of the series containing proceedings of the annual conferences of the American Country Life Association. The eighth conference was held in Richmond, Virginia, October 27-31, upon the topic "Needed Readjustments in Rural Life Today."

The gathering was the second of the annual conferences of the Association which represented experiments in technique or methodology. This book therefore records an attempt to inaugurate the most valuable kind of a discussion for country life leaders, one which utilizes both the resources of the members of the group and those of the so-called expert. The deliberations are therefore presented in such a way as to reveal so far as possible the technique of the conference, as well as to provide a permanent record of what was said and done at Richmond.

Part I contains records of the discussions, including an interpretation of the Student Section by Mrs. W. J. Kitchin.

Part II contains papers and addresses, which were delivered at various meetings of the Conference, but which were not integrated as part of the procedure portrayed in Part I.

Part III contains the annual reports of the American Country Life Association.

HENRY ISRAEL,
*Executive Secretary.*

# CONTENTS

## PART I. THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE


| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| Wednesday Morning | Where are the Maladjustments of Rural Life? | 3 |
| Wednesday Afternoon | (*a*) What is the Farmer's Income? | 10 |
| | (*b*) Proposals for Increasing Farmers' Incomes | 18 |
| Wednesday Evening | How May Incomes be Increased? Clarence Poe | 24 |
| | What is the Agricultural Outlook? E. G. Nourse | 32 |
| Thursday Morning | Suggestions for Raising the Farmer's Standards of Living | 36 |
| Thursday Afternoon | (*a*) Economic Coöperation as a Method of Increasing Income and Raising Standards of Living | 48 |
| | (*b*) The Elements in the Farmers' Standards of Living | 56 |
| Friday Morning | What Adjustments should Cooperatives Make? | 63 |
| | What Adjustments should Community Organizers Make? | 67 |
| | What Adjustments should Educators Make? | 70 |
| | What Adjustments should Religious Workers Make? | 75 |
| Summary of the Discussions | | 78 |
| Critique of the Discussions—E. C. Lindeman | | 89 |
| The Student Section—Mrs. W. J. Kitchin | | 103 |

## PART II. ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

PAGE

PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS: NEEDED READJUSTMENTS IN RURAL LIFE TODAY—KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD . . . . . 111

PUBLIC WELFARE AND DEMOCRACY—HOWARD W. ODUM . . 117

THE FARMER'S ADJUSTMENTS TO THE COMMERCIAL WORLD—CARL C. TAYLOR . . . . . 123

THE CANADIAN SITUATION—J. B. REYNOLDS . . . . . 128

THE FAMILY AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP—E. V. O'HARA . . 132

ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF BELIEF IN TRANSMIGRATION—SAM HIGGINBOTTOM . . . . . 136

## PART III. REPORTS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT . . . . . 143

BUSINESS TRANSACTED DURING THE CONFERENCE . . . . 148

FINANCIAL STATEMENT . . . . . 150

COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION . . . . . 152

INDEX . . . . . 157

## OFFICIALS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION

1926

### OFFICERS

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD, *President,* East Lansing, Michigan.

L. J. TABER, *First Vice-President,* Columbus, Ohio.

MRS. CHARLES C. SCHUTTLER, *Second Vice-President,* Farmington, Missouri.

CHARLES F. JENKINS, *Treasurer,* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

HENRY ISRAEL, *Executive Secretary,* New York City.

MISS ROSALIND M. JEWETT, *Assistant Secretary,* New York City.

E. C. LINDEMAN, *Field Secretary,* High Bridge, New Jersey.

NAT. T. FRAME, *Field Secretary,* Morgantown, West Virginia.

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD, East Lansing, Michigan.

EDMUND DE S. BRUNNER, New York City.

W. J. CAMPBELL, Springfield, Massachusetts.

MISS MABEL CARNEY, New York City.

E. L. MORGAN, Columbia, Missouri.

C. W. PUGSLEY, Brookings, South Dakota.

MRS. CHARLES C. SCHUTTLER, Farmington, Missouri.

L. J. TABER, Columbus, Ohio.

C. C. TAYLOR, West Raleigh, North Carolina.

GENERAL OFFICE

1849 Grand Central Terminal Building,

NEW YORK, N. Y.

# PART I

# THE DISCUSSIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY,
CHICAGO

# WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION

*October 28, 1925*

## WHERE ARE THE MALADJUSTMENTS OF RURAL LIFE?

The Wednesday morning session of the Eighth National Conference of the American Country Life Association convened at nine-thirty o'clock at the Jefferson Hotel, Richmond, Virginia, President Kenyon L. Butterfield presiding.

There was community singing led by Mr. Blaney. Dr. Malcolm Dana offered prayer.

*Introductory Remarks.*

PRESIDENT BUTTERFIELD: There are just two or three announcements in regard to procedure. The program for the morning has been slightly changed and in a few moments I will ask Mr. Elliott to indicate what that program is.

There is one point that comes up at almost every meeting that I want to explain at the outset. This Association, ever since its beginning, has distinctly, as a matter of policy, avoided making pronouncements. This is not a delegated body. It has no official standing. Any expression of opinion is merely that of the group who happen to be together and while we have at times passed resolutions expressing our opinion about certain things, we have been very cautious about attempting to place ourselves on record with reference to disputed questions. We have rather chosen to let the debate, and the conclusions, and the discussions, and the addresses, and the committee reports, with an occasional resolution, stand for the expression of our views. At the same time there are resolutions brought in, and according to our constitution they must be referred to the Executive Board, the Board of Directors. If any one has a resolution that he would like to have considered I suggest that it be brought in as soon as possible and handed to Mr. Israel,

the Executive Secretary; then it will be taken before the Board of Directors and by them reported for whatever action they may suggest.

I might say, for the benefit of those who do not know it, that last year at its conference in Columbus, the Association tried an experiment from the standpoint of the Association program. It is an experiment which, as it proved, was really a demonstration of a method of discussion, which was in charge of Dr. Harrison Elliott of the Union Theological Seminary. The plan on the whole worked so well and commended itself so completely to all present, at least to the Board of Directors, that we asked Dr. Elliott to take charge again this year. I will ask Dr. Elliott at this time to explain whatever he wants to as to procedure, but particularly as to the program of the morning.

*The Plan of the Conference.*

PROFESSOR HARRISON ELLIOTT: Dr. Butterfield has suggested that two or three statements be made in regard to the plan of the Conference. If I understand it, what the Executive Committee and those that were responsible for the program last year felt was this: The very genius of the American Country Life Association is the fact that it brings together persons interested in country life, but who are approaching the country life problem from a variety of angles and points. The reason for a conference is to give opportunity for the persons with those varying points of view to meet together, to exchange their experiences, to help one another on the conference itself.

A second suggestion in regard to the program this year, as indicated in the preliminary notes sent out, was that this meeting really represented a time for a new survey of country life problems and just what the American Country Life Association wished to do. It said that the urgent need of all the forces coming together to take a review of the situation from a national point of view had been stressed, and that therefore, instead of having a special topic, as frequently and usually has been the case, the Conference this year is repeating the general trend of the conference held in Baltimore seven years ago, in which an effort was made to survey the situa-

tion existing at that time and see what we wanted to do next. Consequently this topic, "Needed Readjustments in Rural Life," has been left in this large and rather inclusive form.

On the matter of the particular problems or situations which the Association is to attack, it is suggested that we probably would make our decisions as we are thinking here together in the light of this topic which says, "Readjustments," and I suppose that topic involves a feeling that there are some things now out of adjustment, that some things have happened where there is an unadjustment and where we need to make adjustments together. That would be one item. A second item which would come, of course, into our discussion would be the immediacy of these questions. We want to see what it is that is most pressing in country life. What are the things to which attention must be given if we are going to have any assurance of meeting the country life problem at the present time?

There is another factor which will influence our discussion, namely, the particular function of the American Country Life Association. That is, there would seem to be some kinds of questions that the American Country Life Association group is in a better position to handle than any other group. This being a coöperative association, there might be some kinds of technical questions that could be referred to other agencies, and we want, in our conference here together, to be sure we take hold of those questions in the solution of which there is hope of the Association helping.

Just a word as to the procedure of the Conference itself and then we will go to our discussion. We have here six or seven sessions where we can work partly in smaller groups and partly in the larger group. It was suggested by a representative group of some fifty or so that met together yesterday to lay out the general plans of the Conference, though they did not decide final details, that we might give our attention today to determining what are the areas of the problem that we wish to attack. Is the question that is most important for us the farmer's income? Is the question, standards of life in the country? Is the question that is the most important for us to handle, the interdependence of country life with outside life, the interdependence of the farm groups with the other groups? Is the question that is most important, the relation of agencies in the

country? Which are the ones in which the greatest unadjustment is true and which would be the most important for this Association to consider?

You should have in your hands sheets listing certain suggested issues. I want to make it perfectly evident what this little sheet of material is. When the persons were planning this Conference it seemed that this would be true: That if we were going to have persons from diverse organizations and agencies and background and experience working together, we should need to state the issue of country life in terms of the country situation and not in terms of any particular organization or experience or point of view, because otherwise we would divide up into sectional groups.

The success of this conference will depend upon your taking this mimeograph sheet as nothing but a suggestion and a very tentative one, and your being willing to change it in any way. It has no authority. Nobody's feelings will be hurt if it is destroyed entirely. I hope we will come out of this discussion with many changes in it. It is simply a preliminary list of seven areas that we might possibly attack as a Country Life Association in trying to do our part in bettering conditions in the country. We want, during the next few minutes, to do two things with reference to this list after I have read it. We want to know if there are any omissions in it. As you think about it you will probably say, "Why in the world didn't they include this?" When it comes into your mind don't keep it to yourself, but tell us about it because it probably ought to be included. That is No. 1. In the second place, is there any place you would modify this arrangement of questions?

SUGGESTED ISSUES

I. *Farmer's Income.*—The farmer feels he has not a net income comparable with other groups, that he cannot afford things which other people afford and which he sees urban people have and that he cannot buy what he needs, not to speak of what he would like to have. While he wishes certain developments in country life, such as good roads and better schools, which are dependent upon taxation, he considers high taxes as one of the greatest of his business hazards and a distinct problem in securing an adequate income. He would like to see the taxes lowered and yet he recognizes the necessity of taxes as essential to improvements in the country community.

How can the farmer secure an income sufficient to meet his legitimate needs and desires?

(a) How can he handle to a better advantage the income he now has? If he did this, would he have enough?
(b) What can be done by better processes of marketing to increase the farmer's income?
(c) How can taxation be made low enough so it is not a business hazard and yet high enough so that it pays for the legitimate needs of a growing community? What political action is necessary to secure equitable tax adjustments?

II. *Standards of Life.*—Certain things not before considered of importance in a well-balanced life have now come to be looked upon as essential. New wants have been created. As never before, people in the country are seeking to adjust country life so that it will meet more nearly what is considered an adequate standard for health and sanitation, for the education of their children, for recreation and for the development of religion.

How can those in the country determine what is essential to a balanced standard of life?

How can a more nearly adequate standard of life be achieved for individuals and families in the country in—
(a) Health and sanitation
(b) Education
(c) Dealing with problems of delinquency and dependency
(d) Recreation
(e) Religion.

III. *Relation of Farm Groups to Other Groups.*—Improved methods of communication and increased contact with the larger social areas have made adjustments necessary. The farm group is involved directly with other groupings in transportation, in marketing, and in credits. Some basis of coöperation is necessary in recreation, education and religion. The farmer cannot make himself felt most effectively in national politics except as he coördinates his efforts with other groupings.

How can the necessary adjustments between the farm group and other groups be made most effectively?

IV. *Integrating Country Life.*—There are two types of integration needed in country communities. Some communities that are closely in touch with the larger social areas have lost in their local community consciousness and in their ability to function as a community. They tend to be lost in the city. Other communities are still narrow in viewpoint and out of contact with the developments that are taking place and they lack in leadership and in progress. There is an uneven development as between various country communities.

How can the country community be sure not to lose its local community consciousness when it has these wider contacts?

How can the country community develop within itself adequate facilities for health, social welfare, recreation, education and religion?

V. *Adjustment of Agencies.*—Various agencies are found in the country community, giving attention to health, recreation, education, social welfare and religion. The duplications and relationship between these agencies form one of the problems of adjustment.

How can duplications be eliminated?

In what way can these agencies be adjusted one to the other for the most effective service in the country community?

VI. *Political Adjustments.*—The trend from centralization of functions in the federal government toward decentralization raises certain problems for the farm group. This political tendency comes at a time when the farmer has to some extent lost faith in his own organizations. The farm bloc as an effort to secure occupational legislation has not proved effective.

How can the farmer make himself effective in national politics and in relation to his own interests?

VII. *Attitude Toward the Country.*—There is a certain attitude toward the farmer as a "hick." There is a feeling of superiority in the city, and a feeling of inferiority in the country. The farmer feels that nobody understands him.

How can we deal successfully with the present attitude of the farmer and the present attitude of the city people toward the farmer and farm life?

(a) Is it or is it not true that farming and farm life are disadvantageous?
(b) If farming is now as advantageous as other types of life, how can we correct this false attitude?
(c) If farming and farm life are disadvantageous, how can they become self-respecting and attractive?

Those are the preliminary suggestions. Are there any omissions?

(Numerous suggestions were made and it was agreed to discuss number seven as it came up under the others.)

*Suggestions as to Procedure.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Just this suggestion for the procedure: The program committee has suggested that we divide into small groups so that we can actually get the point of view of every person here. It has been suggested that when we go into these groups we make a division of these topics in this fashion—that each group first discuss the topic it deems most important and then discuss one that is assigned to it, so that all of them will receive attention.

It may help if we come to an understanding as to why we are

dividing into groups. If this conference had only fifty people or twenty-five people so that everybody could take part, we wouldn't divide into small groups. We are dividing into groups for convenience. We are hoping that these smaller groups will represent several points of view and will make possible freer discussion. We will get the reports from those groups and gather them together in the total conference later. You can see this is purely a device for convenience so as to enable a number of people to discuss who couldn't take part because of lack of time.

In these groups we are first going to ask you to take up one of these topics. Suppose this topic is the "Relation of Farm Groups to Other Groups." We want to know what the trouble is in the relation of the farm groups to other groups. We would like you to look at it as you think the person on the farm looks at it. We would like to know what new factors have come into the relation of the farm to the other groups.

Second, we are hoping that you will deal with what are real proposals that are being made for solving this question. And will you please coöperate in your groups by not simply listing a lot of small things that everybody agrees on. We are trying to find where we disagree here and we hope when we come back together we will see where our disagreements are—why you think this and why somebody else thinks that.

May I suggest in the last place that we are not going into these groups to argue, one with the other, for our point of view. I don't believe we will get anywhere by saying, "Now, that point of view has got to be accepted; I am going to stand and argue for it." We are united in our desire to find our way out on country life, and I believe that if we do not get contributed to the solution everything which any group of people has to give, we will have lost somewhere in finding the best way out. Otherwise, there is no reason for coming together. Therefore, our purpose is to contribute ours to the total.

# WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON

## DISCUSSION OF FARMERS' INCOMES

### (A) What Is the Farmer's Income?

*Summary of Discussion.*

Chairman Elliott: The reports from the leaders of the groups which met this morning would indicate that Questions I, II, III and IV—Farmer's Income, Standards of Life, Relation of Farm Groups to Other Groups and Integrating Country Life—received the majority of the discussion. This is not an altogether fair reflection of which topic you would have chosen if entirely free, because in some of the groups, with a little reluctance, you took the one that was suggested and didn't go to a second, but by and large this generalization does seem to represent the sentiment of the groups.

We are going to try this afternoon to gather up the results on at least two of these questions and go on with them this evening. We want this to be our procedure if you are willing: That the recorders and the chairmen of the groups shall represent in the discussion—not in formal reports but in the course of the discussion—the sentiment, the point of view, the suggestions, which came out of these various groups. That is, in the course of the discussion a person who is keeping the record will say that Group One and Group Four made such and such a suggestion. If you object and think that isn't what was said you can come back at the recorder later.

Because of some coöperation that we wish in the conference, we will commence with No. I in this outline—Farmer's Income. (Chairman Elliott read No. I, Farmer's Income, of the suggested issues)—Were there any other factors in the aspects of the situation that came out, and were there any other issues added to this list? May we hear from people from the groups or from the floor?

*Farmers' Incomes Too Low.*

DR. W. E. GARNETT: As secretary of the group that discussed No. I, I might say that it was the unanimous opinion of those present that the income of the farmer is too low—too low to maintain an adequate standard of living and too low in comparison with the income of other occupational groups. This opinion of those present was based on personal experience and observation and on some acquaintance with various government reports giving the result of surveys as to income and price trends for different types of commodities.

The group also considered the significance of this question of low income rather briefly and I presume that it might be summed up by saying that they were unanimously of the opinion that the low income results in low standards of life, in overburdened motherhood, underprivileged and dwarfed childhood and starved community institutions and other things.

It was the opinion of this group that the low income has a great many causes. One thing that was discussed at some length was the great part played by bad seasons and insect ravages, crop diseases, animal diseases and things of that kind, as well as by maladjusted markets and upsets of prices. The question of large taxes was also emphasized considerably. The group did not get around to discuss many remedies for the situation.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Did they add to this list any questions that had to be tackled beside the three given?

DR. W. E. GARNETT: I should say not. They all felt that they couldn't cover the whole thing in the brief time at their disposal.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: At what point did your group desire information that they didn't have?

*More Information Needed.*

DR. W. E. GARNETT: They would have liked to have had more information about exactly what the income of different farm groups in different sections is. The majority of those present were not very well acquainted with such information as exists. Even those that were acquainted with the information felt that there were not yet sufficient data on that subject.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Was there any other group that had discussion of No. I?

*Other Generalizations About Farmers' Incomes.*

PROF. L. A. RAMSDELL: Are you looking for more specific unadjustments on farmer's income? If so, I have one or two in my mind right now. It was suggested in our group that there is an unadjustment between the tenant farmer and the landlord; second, that there is an unadjustment as between the farm production and a lacking market; third, that there is an unadjustment of the farm owners or landlords to the land market; all of which rose out of the question of whether the tenant farmer is paying more rent than he ought to.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Would they add to this list of questions, "What can be done to adjust the relations between the tenant farmer and the landlord?"

PROFESSER L. A. RAMSDELL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Are there any other factors as to income information that need to be before us, that you would like to add to the list? Does this give the picture as far as you are concerned?

*The Question of Family Income.*

DR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: I would like to ask two questions. First, I am assuming that income was considered in terms of net income. If so, to what extent was the family living, which the farmer gets on that farm in addition to his net income, taken in account? That is something which cannot be overlooked. If the income has been considered or is to be considered in terms of net income, what items in the family living have been overlooked or will be overlooked in comparisons which are likely to be made? I raise that question because a number of years ago we were in the habit of giving out reports showing that the farmer makes five hundred dollars labor income, and a good many farmers said, "It is just as well that we quit and go to the city."

PROFESSOR W. E. GARNETT: I would like to say that in our group at least some of them had considered that point. However, I think they also recognized that it is very easy to overemphasize the matter

that Dr. Kirkpatrick is raising for the reason that it costs the farmer a good deal to produce these things. Also, not only does it cost him actual money but it costs him a great deal in time and effort that other occupational groups may be expending in playing golf or reading or something else.

I might have added one other factor that came up in this group that perhaps has a bearing here. There was some little discussion of whether the low income is due to the absolute lack of income or the unwise utilization of income. One of the farmers present resented the attempt of some groups to say just how a farmer should spend his income—as, for example, the farmers have been more or less criticized for spending too much money for automobiles. He very sharply resented any one's saying whether he should spend his income in luxuries or what he might consider necessities.

MRS. CHARLES SCHUTTLER: It would be necessary to decide whether we are talking about a farmer's income or whether we are talking about the farm family income—whether you are going to contrast the farmer's income against that of the workman or business man in town, or whether you are going to contrast the economic results of the efforts of his whole family, because when you are talking about that family, about the food and clothing that are in that net income, you have to take into consideration that in a large proportion of farms a large share of that net income is contributed by the farm family, the unified labor of man, woman and children.

*Overproduction, Security, Etc.*

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: I should like to raise the question as to whether we are getting too many raw products to satisfy the consumers of the world, or is it merely that the farmer isn't getting his share of the dividends on those products? It is frequently said we need better methods of distribution but that may mean physical methods. We need to consider what is the farmer's share in the dividends of distribution.

MISS H. ROELOFS: Ought we not to make a distinction between security of employment and security of income? In our group it was brought out that in the country you could work all of the time but if your work doesn't bring in the security of income it is of little

value. It is different from the city job; if you have work in the city you get your income.

MR. F. B. BOMBERGER: It seems to me that the item of management should be mentioned. I believe that is one of the factors affecting income.

*Summary of Discussion.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: May we try to bring these suggestions together and see what these factors are? The first suggestion that has been made here is an uncertainty as to what the farmer's income is or is likely to be. I mean you have raised the whole question—first, what is his income, and what is the extent to which he knows what it is going to be? There is the whole matter of whether the uncertainty of the farmer's income is a factor in this whole question of the attractiveness of the farm and so on. I don't know what the farmer really does get. The question was raised yesterday in the group as to whether the farm income was really worse or better than other income. That seems to be one which is a question of fact so far as I can make out.

The second issue which was raised was as to whether this estimate that the farm income is too low is true. The other issue that was raised was how you can increase the farm income, or, putting it the other way around, why is it that the farm income isn't higher than it is?

There were two or three suggestions made. One was, are there more farmers than there ought to be, or is the farmer getting too small a proportion of the dividend which the farm is producing? I think some person suggested that there is more production than there is call for. Dr. Taylor said, "Isn't it the other way—that the farmer isn't getting his share of the price of this production?" I don't know whether that is a question of fact or not. If it is true, then it is a question of how can the farmer get a larger share of the dividend? A second matter which was raised here was the question of efficiency in farming.

*Causes of Low Income.*

PROFESSOR W. E. GARNETT: May I suggest another method of classifying this question of causes of low income—first, the causes

that are inherent in the nature of the business, dealing with the forces of nature over which he has no control. There is one other one, the small units of business. The second, causes that the farmer is advisedly responsible for, whether he is owner or tenant. Then, third, the causes that local groups are responsible for—local community groups. Fourth, causes that are inherent in maladjustments that the public at large is responsible for, and those of course would be subdivided into quite a number.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: There was a fourth cause here, namely, the question of taxation: Whether taxation was on the basis of real values or false values, or whether the farmer was carrying too large a share of the taxation. I do not know whether any research work has been done to find out what a farmer's income is.

DR. H. PAUL DOUGLASS: Dr. Kirkpatrick knows.

*What Is the Farmer's Income?*

DR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: I couldn't tell you to my own satisfaction what the net income is on the farm and I doubt if any one can tell you specifically enough so that we can proceed very satisfactorily with this analysis.

It seems to me it might have been well to try to define income before we proceed with our comparisons. There have been a number of studies made. My chief concern has been that we are discussing income from various viewpoints, which is all very enlightening to most of us, but, after all, do we know what the net income of the farmer is, and if so is that the figure which we wish to compare? As I pointed out awhile ago, it does not include certain elements of family living which that farmer gets from his farm by virtue of the observation. We run into the confusion between farm income, family income and total income. If any one can distinguish which one we are going to accept as being net income, then probably we can proceed.

MR. R. WAYNE NEWTON: I think it is very well to bear in mind all of the qualifications which Dr. Kirkpatrick has brought up in regard to farm income. At the same time there are certain relative considerations which would be true regardless of how we define farm income and I think perhaps it would be possible to give a basis for

some such comparison as that. Just a few days ago the Bureau of Income and Revenue issued their statistics of income for the year 1923, which completes the series of statistics back to 1919. If we accept the number of farms in 1920 as shown by the census as being illustrative of the number of operating farmers, we would have this comparison: Whereas in 1919, 65 out of every thousand farmers made a return of income to the Federal Government—in other words, had an income large enough to show a net return of $1,000 to $2,500, according to whether they were married or single—by 1922, only 16 farmers out of every thousand made such return. In 1923 this number had increased to almost thirty farmers out of every thousand. I do not know what the figures are from that time on because they have not been prepared, but I think here are some fairly comparable data.

DR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: In terms of farm income I think the returns which come by the questionnaire method have placed it at $1,253 per year. Am I right, Mr. Newton?

MR. R. W. NEWTON: If I remember correctly the figure for 1922 was about $900.

DR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: In 1922 it was about $900; in 1923 or the next year it was about $1,253.

PROFESSOR L. A. RAMSDELL: Was that the total income or the farm income?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is the farm income.

MR. R. W. NEWTON: It includes the inventory increase or decrease.

*The Labor Income.*

PROFESSOR BRUCE L. MELVIN: I am just trying to figure out how much this talk about the farm income really means because there is the farm labor income to consider and this seems to vary in the different sections of the country. Here is the South, the Middle West, the West and the East. There apparently has been a movement of poor conditions from the Middle West toward the East. Last year when one of our men was making a study here in the New York State somebody said, "Well, you had better be careful while you are around in this part of the country because some fellow will stick a deed to

one of these farms in your pocket and you will be worse off than you were when you came in. The situation is simply this: The market price on the chief product, that is, milk in New York City, is such that the labor income in many cases is below par or below nothing. The farmer loses by working, whereas in the Middle West, according to the latest reports in the papers out there, there has been some money made within the last year. So unless we break this thing up a little we don't know what we are talking about.

PROFESSOR R. HARLAN: There is a factor here which I think that probably we will have to take into account in getting at the solution. That is, that the farm business is not a business that finishes the process of production; therefore, the farmer does not control the ultimate price of his product. He carries the process to a certain point and passes it on to the packer and to the market or commission merchant, or he passes it on to some one who finishes the process and controls the product at the market. It is a question whether the farmer shall have coöperation or shall gear into the total industrial life of the community in a different way. He does not control the finished product.

PROFESSOR L. A. RAMSDELL: May I ask a question? I am not an economist. I want to know whether the $1,295 represents actual cash the farmer has or whether that represents all the things he took out from his farm and used? It makes quite a lot of difference, in my understanding, as to which it was.

DR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: Am I supposed to answer Mr. Ramsdell? So far as I know, my understanding of it is that it represents cash. In addition to that he gets a certain value of food, a certain value of house rent to the extent of from $2,000 to $2,200—that is roughly.

PROFESSOR W. E. GARNETT: What the farm supplies, the cost of gross supplies, both in the way of work and in the way of upkeep?

DR. KIRKPATRICK: The value of those supplies at the time used.

PROFESSOR GARNETT: Not the cost of producing?

DR. KIRKPATRICK: The value in the majority of cases would about equal the cost of production.

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: I would like to raise one or two questions. In the first place, I believe that if we had the best experts of the country stand up before this audience and give definitions of all of

these terms the audience wouldn't understand them after they gave them. Therefore, I think, with the group in which we are working, that it is useless to try to argue this. What we ought to do is to evolve this discussion to the point where we find out what the farmer thinks or what we think, and then let us turn it over to somebody who can tell us something. I think we have a bunch of highbrow economists here who would like to get into a quarrel, and I don't think they ought to be allowed to. I think this group ought to discuss it to a certain point, and then that Dr. Nourse, Dr. Kirkpatrick and Dr. Poe ought to tell them what they know and maybe some things that they don't know.

## (B) METHODS OF INCREASING FARMERS' INCOMES

*Summary of Discussion.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: If you will permit the Chairman to rule at this point that the discussion has gone as far as it can. As I understand it, we are to find out, as Dr. Taylor suggested, whether the temper of the farmer is in thinking he hasn't enough, or whether it is psychology you are dealing with; second, if I understood it correctly, whether the place we had to attack this problem was on the efficiency of the farmer, or, as Dr. Taylor suggested, on the fact that he wasn't getting his share of the production, or, as some others suggested, on that fact that there was not a high enough rate placed on the comforts he has. So we have: One, whether we are dealing, in this attitude of the farmer, with the psychology or with the fact; on the other hand, whether efficiency of management of the farm is our place of attack, whether he gets more of his share of some things than other people, or whether our place of attack should be that nobody gets enough.

I take it, from this discussion, that this group feels that the farmer isn't getting enough. This gentleman feels that he is getting enough of what we sometimes call the perquisites of life. So that, so far as I can see, we have gotten as far as we can get. Recognizing that maybe we do want to question these persons a little further later in our session, would it be fair to try and find at what point and in what way it is proposed to increase the farmer's income?

I suppose nobody would object to the farmer getting more money if he found some way of doing it. Are there definite proposals in the groups and at which point do you want to attack this question?

There were four questions raised. One was the question of the hazard of the farm—that is, the fact that there is no surety of income, that you are dependent upon weather. The second was the question of the efficiency of the farm itself—that is, the matter of management. The third had to do with the question of overproduction, or whether there was a share of the dividends which was closely related to marketing and the whole question of the relation between production on the farm and the ultimate consumer. The fourth had to do with taxes. We ought to take these one at a time, I should think, and see what propositions the group has to offer.

Did there come from the groups any definite proposals as to how the farm income could be increased or conserved or handled in a better way than at present? What are the definite places at which suggestions were made?

*Proposal of Coöperative Marketing.*

PROFESSOR W. E. GARNETT: On this question we had one definite proposal and that was the only one we got. It was the opinion of the group that the most effective way of increasing the income was through coöperative action, especially in the field of marketing. It was their further conclusion that present efforts in that field are still on trial as to their ultimate success and that the weak factor in the situation was the lack of an adequate educational basis for this coöperative activity, especially education along social lines and education along business lines. They wanted to present the definite recommendation as a means of helping along in this matter that this Association consider the advisability of passing a resolution asking the different agencies having to do with education, such as the various forms of the press, the church bodies and the school forces, to give more attention to these lines of education that I mention and to support more vigorously the efforts of the coöperative associations in the direction of educating the mass of the people in coöperative effort.

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: I should like to know whether, when they

spoke of education, they meant education in coöperation or whether they meant education in economic relations?

PROFESSOR GARNETT: Both were stressed somewhat.

*The Matter of Efficiency.*

MR. CLARENCE WOODS (Staunton, Virginia): We have spent a portion of our life in the city and rural sections. Each has been equally an interesting problem to study. As we set up side by side those four points which you have raised there on the board, we feel that there isn't a greater hazard in the rural section than there is in the business world in the city. I feel that we are missing the point there when we are trying to place too much emphasis on the farmer's hazard. We find the same thing in the business world.

You find in the second instance that efficiency is always governed by the monetary standard at hand. Your institutions of learning become efficient in accordance to the income that you have received in order to set them upon an efficient basis. We, therefore, see the same situation in the farming business.

Therefore we would come to the third, or the marketing proposition. We are convinced, as we have studied the problem of the farm population of America, that there has to be an equal distribution of the dividends of the products of the farm, otherwise the farmer cannot become efficient in his production. He hasn't the means; he can't supply himself with the necessary machinery; neither can he educate his boys properly in an institution.

We feel that the crux of the whole matter is not in taxes—I don't believe our farm people want to evade taxes—but we believe it is in the inequal distribution of the income from his labors; there is too great a difference between wholesale prices of farm products and those which consumers pay for there products.

PROFESSOR PERRY P. DENUNE: I would like to ask a question regarding the dividend. By what standard shall we decide whether the farmer gets his share of the dividend or not?

MR. W. H. KENDRICK (Morgantown, West Virginia): In looking over this group it is very evident that there are a great many farmers in the room who are saying nothing. I notice that the gentleman

opposite me is very much interested in this discussion. Some of us would like to hear from two or three of the real farmers present.

MRS. CLYDE MOREHEAD (Stuarts Draft, Virginia): I have been listening to this discussion with more or less patience and I think that if you people would evolve some method by which we farm people could get what our production is worth, then we could pay our fertilizer bills and our taxes and our mortgages and possibly leave something over for a few good clothes so that we wouldn't be recognized as farm people when we go to town.

MISS W. L. WELLER: There is all this talk about the farmer being satisfied with the living conditions on the farm. I think that every one should have the necessities of life and the farmer also deserves an opportunity for the cultural things too. I wanted to ask the farmers in the room whether they are satisfied with the prices they receive for their products?

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Would you be willing to say that what we want now is definite proposals on this question of the farmer getting his share? If I get the general sentiment here it is that the farmer isn't getting enough for his products. We have had one proposal as to how that might be handled, particularly in the field of marketing. Are there any other definite proposals?

*Education in Economic Relationships.*

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: The first word that I would utter, which may seem to be a very broad generalization, but which I think is something concrete, is "education." Everybody says that is a broad word. I mean just exactly what I say when I say education concerning the economic relationships of the society in which we live. I mean what I say when I say that the farmer isn't getting it. How can he be either efficient in his production, which he largely measures in terms of outgo and ingo, or in his solving of his marketing problem, when he doesn't know a confounded thing about either one of these? This conference has decided that the outstanding adjustment which needs to be made is that of the farmer to his commercial world. I think we ought to get down to brass tacks with it in our schools, our colleges, our extension divisions, our Smith-Hughes

schools and every place else where an attempt is made to educate concerning economic relationships.

MR. BURNHAM (Virginia): I think it is taking a long time to get this across. I am getting to be an old man. I believe that the school is the place by which we will get there in the end. We want to work with the old people because we need immediate results but the school is the place where we ought to start our work. If we will put this education in the eighth grade, where we are going to get our farmers and farmers' wives of the future, I believe we can solve this problem and we will get this coöperative action when they become farmers and farmers' wives because we will educate them as children. Why do I say that? Because in work with the farmers we find now that the greatest trouble is in getting the coöperation of the farmer himself. We have plenty of men who will tell them how they can do things better but the farmer won't do them. It seems to me that the school is the place where this education should be given.

*Summary.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Our time has come practically to a close. If I get the feeling of this group, it still is that whatever we may do in the way of comparison the farmer somewhere is getting the worst of it in the amount of income, in the chance for the extras of life, and so on, and we would like to attack the problem to see what can be done to make the necessary increase. There have been three definite suggestions made this afternoon. One has been in the terms of efficiency—that there is still room for improvement in the scientific management of the farm, even though the farmer may at times resent that, but that perhaps we have more to do in the realm of his understanding, not only of how to produce more on the farm, but also of his relationships with other economic groups and his relationship to the market and the list of things Doctor Taylor suggested, and that means very definite and specific education in the Smith-Hughes schools, the grade schools, the high schools, the colleges, and so on, giving attention to the economic as well as the production factors. The third suggestion very definitely is that we should follow up this matter of coöperative action. We haven't

discussed further as to what you mean by its being on trial and where the difficulties are and so on, but that is the third definite thing which is necessary if the farmer is to get his share of the dividend. I think that perhaps we ought to go into this matter of education in more detail and we will take it up under the standards of living.

We are meeting at eight o'clock this evening. I am hoping we will have not only the discussion but some help on these economic factors from Dr. Nourse and Dr. Poe.

# WEDNESDAY EVENING

## HOW MAY INCOMES BE INCREASED?

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Some of you who are here this evening were not here this afternoon, and it may be of help in picking up the discussion if your chairman of discussion spends two or three minutes in summarizing what happened.

We have been working together trying to locate areas in which those who are interested in the country feel special attention should be given for the improvement of country life, particularly such areas as an organization of this kind, the American Country Life Association, might work upon. This afternoon we took one of those areas, the question of the farmer's income, for discussion. There was considerable debate back and forth as to what the farmer's income is, and whether it really is adequate as compared to other groups. We recognized the fact that it was a much more complicated problem than could be settled in the afternoon.

In trying to determine what were the points at which effort should be put if we were going to deal with this problem, four questions came before the group as possible contributing causes: The hazard of farm life and of farming, and comparison with other occupations, although some doubted whether there was more hazard in farming than in other lines of endeavor; the question of efficiency, both in the management and spending of money; the question of whether there really is overproduction or whether it is true that the farmer is not getting his share of the price for which his products are sold, which raised the whole question of marketing and ultimate price of goods and question of taxes.

The discussion of the afternoon centered more particularly, as far as this group is concerned, upon, first, the matter of coöperative action—whether it was proving effective—and the relation of public opinion to it; second, the question of education, the suggestion

being made that the farmer had been educated in how to produce more but that very little attention, relatively, had been given to the economic factors of his relation to other groups—marketing, credits, and so on—and that from public schools on through college more attention must be given to that aspect of the question; and, third, the whole matter of still further attention to efficiency.

The program committee of the conference, in talking it over, felt that if this evening we could look at the problems of the afternoon through the eyes and with the perspective of two or three persons of our group it might help us in our discussions of tomorrow morning. So this evening we are going to ask Dr. Clarence Poe and Dr. E. G. Nourse to help us upon certain points.

First we want to call upon Dr. Clarence Poe, editor and owner of the *Progressive Farmer*, to comment upon our discussion of the afternoon and the approach that we have been making to this question of farm income, particularly throwing such light upon it as he may have from his intimate knowledge of the conditions.

DR. CLARENCE POE (Raleigh, North Carolina): I shall just take a little while to comment on some of the things that were discussed this afternoon, following some of the headings that have been listed on your blackboard.

Take first the question of the hazards of the farmer. Somebody said here this afternoon that there are hazards in everything—hazards in all forms of business; and so there are. But farming is really an extra hazardous occupation because the farmer is exposed to all of the usual hazards of business such as the fluctuations of prices, the ups and downs of commerce, etc. The farmer is just as much exposed to all such war, panic, or "deflation" influences as the merchant and the manufacturer; and in addition to that, he is exposed to the hazards of weather, the hazards of insect destruction, and so on, to an extent that doesn't apply in other lines of business.

So the hazards of farming are more serious than those in other occupations. Then, too, the farmer as a rule is not well protected against a type of hazard that is insurable in other businesses. I have been moved to pity a number of times when the poorer tenants around me would lose a horse or cow. That doesn't mean anything to you, but you take a poor fellow who has just managed to get

ahead; he may have six or eight children and about two hundred dollars that he has saved up and put into a horse and about one hundred dollars that he has saved up and put into a cow. If that cow dies, it is a serious thing for him. Right on my own place a tenant's cow died the other day and it represented, I suppose, maybe a fourth of the total amount he had saved up. We ought to have here in America, as they have in so many European countries, a system of insurance for livestock. Of course that is a hazardous business but it can be worked out, and that is one of the problems that ought to have our attention.

Then the problem of hail insurance. I know that the Connecticut Valley Tobacco Growers' Association, in reorganizing, is making provision for hail insurance as a part of its program. That is another one of the things that ought to have our attention.

One of the particularly serious hazards of farming is that when the farmer gets behind, when he gets down financially, the cost of credit for his living expenses is so devastating. Here in the South with our "time prices" crop mortgage system of credit, whereas the business man gets credit at six or eight per cent, the farmer really pays sixty to eighty per cent per annum. I made an investigation ten years ago and I made an investigation again last year, getting reports from hundreds of sources, from hundreds of farmers from Virginia to Texas inclusive, finding the average "time prices" charge on eight different items. It was remarkable how uniform was the charge by communities and states.* For credit items, when farmers purchase their supplies during the summer, they are charged twenty per cent more than the cash price. The average time price item runs let us say four months, which I believe is fair because of the

* *Note.*—The averages were as follows for the whole Cotton Belt in 1924:—

| | Av. cash price | Av. time price | Av. per cent increase |
|---|---|---|---|
| Corn, per bushel | $ 1.33 | $ 1.58 | 18.7 |
| Flour, per sack | 1.63 | 1.92 | 17.7 |
| Hay, per ton | 24.08 | 29.06 | 20.7 |
| Meat, per pound | .20 | .23½ | 17.5 |
| Oats, per bushel | .88 | 1.05 | 19.3 |
| Lard, per pound | .17½ | .21 | 20 |
| Sugar, per pound | .10 | .12 | 20 |
| Molasses, per gallon | .91 | 1.09 | 19.7 |

fact that a very considerable proportion of the farmers and tenants are able to take care of their wants during the early months of the year and they only run out of cash entirely and have to depend wholly on the time merchant in the later period. At any rate, a heavy volume of this "time prices" business comes in July, August, and September, maturing in November. If the farmer is paying a flat twenty per cent for his purchases above the cash price and that account matures in four months (and if it is not paid then it begins to draw legal interest), the farmer is really paying what is equal to sixty per cent a year. No business on earth can stand that sort of thing, and it is one of the crying iniquities of the South that it persists here.

You take this matter of poor land: If you go through the Cotton Belt this year you will find in the same county farmers who are making one-tenth of a bale of cotton to the acre and farmers who are making two bales of cotton to the acre. Now there is no system of marketing under heaven that will enable the farmer who is getting one-tenth of a bale of cotton to the acre to maintain a decent standard of living for himself and his family. You will find here in the South farmers getting eight bushels of corn per acre and other farmers getting eighty bushels of corn per acre, and no system of marketing will enable the eight-bushel-per-acre farmer to maintain himself and his family in decency and comfort. That is one of the tragedies of agriculture.

Certain other matters may be briefly summarized as follows: To insure efficiency for the farmer, these things must always be kept in mind—that you not only must have a hard-working individual, but you have to have the *tools,* the *soil-fertility,* and the *farming equipment* of the right sort to give returns for his labor.

That leads to one other point that I wish we could stress among all our agricultural workers and that is to get the farmer and the farm worker and the tenant farmer—everybody—to think, when he goes to buy a thing, as to whether he is buying it for a *productive* or for a *consumptive* purpose. I believe in the farmer having his Ford, or a better car if he can afford it, but we need perpetually to remind the man who is trying to get a foothold financially—the man who is trying to get ahead and increase his labor-income—we need

to encourage him to say that the first things in the world for him to buy are these things that will increase his earning power; then he will be better able to get these other things that are more nearly luxuries.

Take the topic of overproduction: How is that going to be solved? For one thing, we want to encourage a more careful study of prospective crop acreages. We had a very striking illustration of what can be accomplished in that respect right here in the South this year. The United States Government last February issued a report of "intentions to plant"—what increases in acreage the farmer had in mind in his intentions to plant for 1925. That report showed that there was going to be a very marked increase in the sweet potato acreage and when the report came out the farmers simply turned around and sharply cut that acreage. But what about cotton? Many of you know that the price of it has been going down, down, down in the last ninety days as an enormous production has piled up. One of those insects that has done the farmer more harm than anything else—and that is the demagogue politician—got the notion that these reports of intentions to plant were a sort of bureaucratic interference, and Congress actually passed a law forbidding the publication of intentions-to-plant reports on cotton! In the sweet potato crop the farmers saw what was coming and reduced their acreage, but they had no such guide in their cotton crop; they planted a big acreage and now the price drops and drops and drops. There, I believe, is one of the ways whereby production can be in some measure controlled. I believe also that with the development of our coöperative marketing associations, our farmers are going to find out more and more to what extent overproduction prevails. These surpluses are going to be carried over, for they can't be consumed, and the farmer will therefore learn when surpluses exist and adjust his acreage for the coming year. Of course, as was said this morning, we certainly seem to have too many farmers. I don't know what is going to be the result of the competition of the efficient farmer with the inefficient farmer. Here is what my *hope* is and what I believe we ought to strive to bring about: We ought to recognize the fact that we have in America, as Dr. Liberty Hyde Bailey has so well put it, thousands and tens of thousands of persons who are farming

but who are really not farmers at heart. They are, as he says, simply "survivors of a rural stage of society." The human race is really just coming into an industrial era with all its diversified town-and-city occupations. Two hundred years ago probably eighty-five per cent of the people were farmers—that is, of the active workers—and we still have on the farm millions of people who haven't any particular love for the land. They would rather be doing something else, but they were born on the land and accident or inertia has kept them there.

What I believe one of the great goals of country life ought to be is the development, the holding on the farm (and that is one of the things I fear we are not going to be able to do but that I *wish* we might do) of the people who really love the land, and the elimination of these other less efficient farmers who do not care for the soil, the shifting of them to other occupations.

Another topic you have been discussing is that of getting a larger share of the consumer's dollar. I think the best answer to that is Denmark. I had the interesting privilege of going there thirteen years ago on my wedding trip, and while I went on my honeymoon, I managed to see a lot of Denmark, too.

The Danish farmer gets a larger share of the consumer's dollar, in the first place through better grading. I went to the egg societies. Every egg had a little date stamped on it—the date it was laid—and the Danish farmer doesn't suffer any losses on account of eggs of uncertain age, or odor, or flavor. The Danish farmer also gets a larger share of the consumer's dollar because he puts his product up in more finished form. He doesn't sell grain; he sells butter and cheese, and he sells breakfast bacon and things like that, and he gets a market for them. He gets a profit, first, on growing a crop; then he gets a second profit by converting it into some more finished form. He gets this high percentage of profit because, with his process of standardization and strict governmental supervision, he produces a high quality product that is in demand in the English markets and the other markets of Europe, whereas the farmers of Ireland, who also make bacon and butter, are not able as yet to command the same high price.

Now just a word or two about coöperation. Talking about Den-

mark leads very naturally to that. I had the privilege of being the first man in North Carolina to join the coöperative cotton marketing association. I preach coöperation in season and out of season. But there have been certain defects of coöperative marketing practice that it is only fair to recognize and acknowledge that we must remedy. Our coöperative marketing associations must be made *democracies*. If coöperative marketing meant the finding by some mysterious process of a group of supermen for managers, and having them hand down to the farmer the exalted product of their superior wisdom and brains, I never would have been able to get up much enthusiasm about the coöperative marketing system. I know the farmer needs the money, but I know that if coöperative marketing doesn't develop *men,* it is going to fail of half of its mission, and we have got to make the development of manhood through democracy one of our fundamental aims. The great ideal of coöperative marketing must be to enable the farmer to stand as a man among men, an equal among equals, having worked out by his own brain and courage and stamina and patience, a system of marketing that will enable him thus to stand as an equal among equals and as a man among men. Unless the coöperative marketing association can develop this spirit of democracy, unless we are willing to trust the individual farmer, he is not going to trust us. In our coöperatives the same principle applies as Emerson laid down in the case of government: An autocracy is like a great big ship and rides gloriously in fine weather, but when the storm comes it is the raft of democracy that gets through without breaking to pieces on the rocks.

Just a word about the standard of living before I pass on to my conclusion. You will find listed on your summary the inquiry as to what the farmer can do to maintain proper standards of health and sanitation. I want to submit to you this evening that that isn't just the individual farmer's problem; that is something it is also the duty of society to look after. I thank God I have lived long enough to see all opposition to public education give way even in our most backward sections. I thank God I have lived long enough to have everybody agree to "the equal right of every child born on earth to have the opportunity to burgeon out all that is within him." I

hope I shall live long enough to see society also recognize the equal right of the poorest child to just as good an opportunity in a fight against disease and accident and pestilence, as the richest child in America has. I believe that the building of country hospitals everywhere, open on equal terms to rich and poor, is one of the greatest things that this Country Life Association could attempt to foster. Especially, my friends, is that needed for the infants, for the babies, in the homes of our tenants and poorer classes.

Just let me say in conclusion that all of us who are engaged in this task of trying to better the conditions of country life are working in a very critical period. We only have to look across the water at Old England, a nation not dying but giving up the supreme power as rapidly as I think any nation has ever done. It is almost heartbreaking to see it. I find it accepted by the English people themselves; I read it in English papers. And England is the victim of a failure to recognize the warning that Goldsmith gave two centuries ago when he said:—

> "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
> Where wealth accumulates, and men decay.
> Princes and lords may flourish or may fade—
> A breath can make them, as a breath has made;
> But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,
> When once destroyed, can never be supplied."

England forgot that warning, ignored it, made itself simply a great commercial nation, and failed to build up that "bold peasantry," that sturdy rural population. When the Boer War came on they measured the volunteers, took their physical standards, and so on, and the physical decline of the English soldier was striking. Lloyd George sought to bring about a remedy, but again it wasn't done effectively, and England, because of its absorption in industrial life, because it has thrown everything on the side of commerce and ignored the development of her country population, is paying the penalty.

The late Secretary Wallace pointed out that America today is choosing, consciously or unconsciously, by its national policy whether or not it is going to follow the path of England. He said that the next twenty years will determine whether the United States is going

to definitely fix its policies and aims at being simply a great commercial nation or whether it will seek to preserve the proper balance between industry and a great, sturdy, thrifty farm population.

I am glad that so many of you are throwing yourselves into the fight to keep America on the right side, to enable it to take the right path as it stands now at the cross-roads. I am glad to be a comrade and a worker with you and I congratulate you upon having so great an opportunity for service.

## WHAT IS THE AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK?

DR. E. G. NOURSE: There is unquestionably a very considerable difference of opinion in regard to the agricultural situation at the present time, and it is going to be a very serious matter if at a time when agriculture is confronted with a serious condition as to its economic status, we should be misled by stories, by views of an optimistic future. I must confess that I do not believe the condition is satisfactory, I do not think that it is in the process of working itself out, of curing itself; I do not think that we can adjourn now and go home and safely abandon the labors to which this organization and others like it have dedicated themselves.

Looking backward, I think that most of us will agree that the conditions in the latter part of the nineteenth century were by no means satisfactory for American agriculture. The free land effort, the tremendous flood of immigration, the extraordinarily rapid development of transportation facilities brought an adjustment of agricultural production very unsatisfactory to farming. From the mid-nineties, during a period of about twenty years, a process, after turning the tide there, was working in quite the opposite direction, and one prominent person thinks it one of the greatest unexplained phenomena of economics. How was it that during a period of twenty years agricultural prices rose more rapidly and more steadily than those of other classes of commodities? It seems to me, as a matter of fact, that the answer is extremely simple. Perhaps that is because I do not penetrate so far into the mysterious depths as this gentleman does. He and a good many other people think that mysterious because they are getting the worm's-eye view of it. I don't know if you remember that phrase; it has merit. They are

looking at it from the low point of depression. They are accepting a worm's position there, if you please, and marveling that from the mid-nineties there should have been such a disproportionate advance in agricultural prices. For myself, I prefer to take a bird's-eye view of the thing and look from the top down—look from a satisfactory condition of American agriculture, as we found it in 1913; and instead of a remarkable and inexplicable disproportionate rise in agricultural prices, as compared with industrial prices, from a condition which would be accepted in the nineties, it seems to me what we do have is a looking back from the period of 1913, roughly speaking, to another period of twenty years, during which agriculture at last had pulled itself out of the mire of the nineties, out of a very abnormal situation of depression growing out of the circumstances following the Civil War. In other words, during a period of relative prosperity, of quite satisfactory foreign markets, agriculture was working up and adjusting so that from approximately 1909 to 1914 we saw our agriculture in a satisfactory and prosperous condition relative to the rise of the country.

Now the question which concerns us here is whether the forces which were operating during that period are now to be resumed. There are some who take the position that again we have scraped the bottom of a depression, and that we are going to see during the years just ahead of us a similarly advantageous adjustment of agriculture to our other industries. Frankly it seems to me that that rests upon a very incomplete analysis of the elements that enter into that situation. In spite of having gotten through the more acute stages of the depression, in spite of a rather extraordinary wheat export last year and fairly satisfactory conditions this year, I don't think we can look to the years ahead of us with any degree of comfort. If I had time I would explain why I think, even if the European War had not come on, we would have found that this ascending current in agriculture, instead of going on up during the next five years, would have reached its crest or would have perhaps turned downward, or at the very best would very much have checked its rise. The story is so fascinating, from my way of thinking, that I wish I had time. But, very roughly speaking, I think what we had was a catching-up of industrial development and even a running of

industrial development ahead of agriculture. It is epitomized in the very keenness of the industrial and trade struggle which precipitated the war.

So the question is: "In the years which are ahead of us are we going to have a recovery of industry which will facilitate a recovery of agriculture, a rebuilding of our export market; or has something been destroyed which perhaps will never be rebuilt, and must we await the very slow rebuilding of another system of world business organization?" I think it is the latter. I went to some pains to expound that in a book,* which very few if any of you have read I am sure, published a year or so ago, and I think I can explain the apparent changes that have occurred in the year or so since that is out. I still believe that that situation is with us and that it is idle for American agriculture to expect a return of prosperity because of the rehabilitation of the world market on which we depended to a considerable extent.

It is unsatisfactory for one to have to present a negative message in this connection, but I do think that agriculture has been suffering during the last few years a very serious decline in its measures of reconstruction, a very serious delay in terms of constructive leadership because of a tendency to turn toward quick—I might even say miraculous—sources of recovery; first, that of a reconstructed foreign market; second, that of some measure from within which would solve the farmer's problem or take the problem away. The one thing which I want to suggest in that connection to this audience is that it seems to me that in a body like the American Country Life Association, or other like bodies that have a service of real rural leadership, the best thing that they can do is to advance public opinion to an acceptance of that as a very stern, searching, long-time program of adjustment of our American agriculture—to conditions which, in the main, not exclusively but in the main, are American conditions.

I think that there has been a certain tendency of agricultural leadership to follow lay opinion in the country, to accept the demand of the farmer, and a very natural demand, that legislative or other

* American Agriculture and the European Market. New York, The McGraw Hill Company, 1924.

measures be put in operation which would take care of him, of his industry, at the point where it happened to stand at the moment. Now it is necessary to turn upon farmers—depressed, denying themselves, having to accept a lower standard of living—and say, "We can't do that. What we have got to do is to accept a process of readjustment within our own industry."

I don't think that the easy gospel is a safe gospel. I think that it is only this hard gospel of readjusting which will in any way meet the needs of the situation. It seems to me that we have to accept, first, the idea that foreign markets will not be brought to the support of agricultural prices, and, since these prices are confessedly unsatisfactory prices, that, second, we have to face the problem of adjusting our agricultural industry in this country in terms of its quantity, in terms of its sectional commodities, in terms of its costs, to that situation as it exists.

It seems to me therefore that with the conditions as unsatisfactory as to farmer's income as they are, and if you agree with me and other pessimists as to the outlook for agriculture, then the one characteristic that your program of discussion of local leadership and education should have would be that of readjustment, of study of the actual conditions of the market, of study of the actual conditions of production and of its costs, and of study of the organization of our industry as a means for meeting a situation which is essentially unsatisfactory.

# THURSDAY MORNING

## SUGGESTIONS FOR RAISING THE FARMERS' STANDARDS OF LIVING

*Summary of Discussion.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Will you permit, at the beginning of our discussion, a brief summary and suggestions in regard to the morning's conference? If you will remind yourself of the six areas or items of maladjustment which were suggested at the beginning of the conference yesterday you will find they are as follows: Farmer's Income; Standards of Life; Relation of Farm Groups to Other Groups; Integrating Country Life; Adjustment of Agencies; Political Adjustments, or Political Action.

It has become quite evident as the discussion has proceeded that the two main interests of the group are the first two of this list—farmer's income in its relation to standards of life, and standards of life as dependent upon farmer's income. The two points that the group would like to see improved in country life are the standards of life and the income as they are related, one to the other.

It has also become evident, seemingly, as we have progressed in the discussion, that the other four items have to do with ways and means of working together, of coöperating, in accomplishing something as a group in raising the standard of life and in improving farmer's income. That is, you have talked about the relation of the farm group to other groups. Dr. Nourse insisted last night that unless those in the country looked at this problem and worked it out in relation to the total situation, it would not be possible to improve farmer's income nor to raise standards of living, so that he was raising one question of group action for coöperative action—the relation of the farm group to other groups.

If you will look at these six topics you will find that the first two represent the thing that you would like to see accomplished, or at

least try to find out what should be accomplished, and the next four are problems that have to do with coöperative action in making some progress toward these two main issues.

With that in mind and growing out of our discussion of yesterday, we have put on the board this suggested outline for our work this morning, which you may modify if you desire; namely, that yesterday afternoon we did work upon the matter of farmer's income, finding three points at which the group wished to take hold—increasing efficiency, education in economic relations, coöperative action, and Dr. Nourse's suggesting the adjustment gradually and fundamentally to the total situation. We have not yet heard from the sections that met yesterday that were dealing with standards of of life as to their conviction as to the particulars in which the standard of life in the country most needs adjustment and what are the most serious difficulties in achieving an adequate standard of life.

We propose that the first few minutes this morning shall be given to reports from these three groups that dealt with this problem with such supplemental information as you may wish to give, so that we may see, in relation to the standards of life, the places that seem to you most necessary that we shall take hold; but then that following this we shall really come to what seems to be the main function of this group; namely, where and how can we best take hold in cooperative action. That has to do with these others: Coöperative action in relation to farmer's income, in developing within the community adequate facilities for health, and the relation of the farm group to the other groups. There have emerged thus far in the discussion four specific questions in relation to that which you may want to modify—coöperatives, community integration, that is the various movements within the community for community development in community consciousness, the relation to national agencies and political action.

If we followed this outline we would then find what are the most important immediate adjustments, the most pressing, the most significant adjustments, as far as the standards of life in the community are concerned, and what are the most serious difficulties in achieving those, recognizing that we have already dealt with farmer's

income as one of the most serious difficulties and seeing what other difficulties might be added. Then we would go to these other four aspects of the question which have to do with what can be accomplished in the way of coöperative action. Later in the day, if you care to, we can go back to special committees to discuss the question, in what way can the American Country Life Association be of most help in these changes in coöperative action that you are interested in having take place. Recognizing that this is a grouping of people whose interest is in coöperative action—that is, they are made up of various agencies—we want to see we can work together more effectively.

Are there any suggestions? This is the proposed procedure for the morning and we will revise it as we go along if you prefer. May we hear from the three groups. I think we would like to hear from them first as to the points of emphasis, as to what the groups felt were the most essential changes and the difficulties which had to be overcome, and any suggestions. Mr. Howell is reporting for Group No. 8.

*A Balanced Standard and Its Achievement.*

MR. A. E. HOWELL: In answering the first of the two questions under standards of life—namely, how can those in the country determine what is essential to the balanced standard of life—the group launched immediately into the school problem and the problem of adequate rural school teachers, of proper training, of maturity and long-time service, and they felt that here was one of the first points of emphasis in determining what is the standard of life and also in answering the second question—how can a more nearly adequate standard of life be achieved for individuals and families in the country—because upon its leaders, the group seemed to decide, depends the action of the group, and knowledge of the group action is needed. The second point discussed was that of the leadership of the rural church—that is, the rural minister—and there were members of the group who felt that religion in rural life was primary and education secondary. But the two points, summing up the total feeling of the group, seemed to work together and could hardly be separated as I judged the feeling of the group.

The other four points listed here—health and sanitation, dealing with problems of delinquency and dependency, or in other words social welfare, and recreation—depend upon the leadership in the community, in the schools, in the churches, and also the lay leadership.

Then the matter of training teachers and training ministers was emphasized as one of the essentials; that is, we have got to get back of the local group to get the properly qualified leaders to the colleges—perhaps I had better go farther back; we have to get clear back into the schools where the children are taught and teach them the way of life in a rural community to give them the idea that they should be training themselves to stay in the country; then on to high school training for life in the country, and then the colleges, and especially in the normal schools and seminaries should this be emphasized.

I believe the essential point which the group seemed to feel should be brought out was changing the rural person's point of view; that is, letting the rural people feel the problems and then feel that they could solve those problems if they wanted to and then start doing it—the point of view of we have got something to do, and we can do it—let's go!

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Are there any questions you want to ask Mr. Howell? Mr. Landis, will you report?

*Developing Local Tastes and Desires.*

MR. B. Y. LANDIS: There was a feeling that one of the things that is troubling the farmers in regard to higher standards of living at present is the very agencies which had been trying to stimulate them to get a higher standard of living. The farmers have been resenting the methods of these agencies because they have pushed ahead too rapidly. For example, school taxes have in some instances been raised too rapidly and the community has been dissatisfied after they have been raised. Frequently the farmers don't know what the voluntary agencies are about. They think something is being put over on them, and after it has been put over they try to get out from under.

The main problem was thought to be how to set up, or how to

start discussion of, real objectives within the rural community, how to get the people to discuss these objectives, how to get enough initiative in the farm group to solve its own problems and to set up its own standards.

There was felt to be a need of an agency that would really approach the matter from the point of view of developing local tastes and desires. It was felt that we need to change the national state of mind in regard to this matter, that we have been so used to agencies that have put things across, and we want to get away from the agency that simply wants to set up its local unit in the community; that the agencies have been propaganda organizations. The problem now is to educate the community so that it will engage in self-education and discovery. It was felt that we had lost faith in education and in the educational process and that we must regain it if we had lost it. It was felt that we must have faith in growing things in the rural community. By growing things we meant local projects, letting them develop within the community.

Then it was brought out that there is danger of overemphasizing agencies; there is such a thing as community process, which perhaps we don't very well understand; that we need to study this community process; that there is a great need for information about this process—what goes on within the community.

It was also said that we need to work with small groups—small groups in adult education—and take a great deal of time in this matter of stimulating interest in higher standards of living. It was pointed out that Seaman Knapp knew how to use demonstrations and had been very successful in stimulating desires for higher standards of living.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: There was a third group that worked on this subject.

MR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: Group No. Six decided on the topic of standards of living for discussion after they had finished with farmers' incomes. We had about three-quarters of an hour left for discussion. We were unable to get any consensus of opinion but the tendency seemed to be for various ones in the group to want to stress schooling or education and to go into a rather elaborate discussion of housing and various other phases. So in the time at our

disposal we were unable to come to any definite statement of opinion.

*Summary of Discussion.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: The discussion of the three reports have emphasized, if you will note, three things that you may want to keep in mind, and most of those have been along the line of method, again, of how we can work together. What was suggested yesterday has been suggested again with regard to farmer's income—that the problem is an educational problem and we will have to go back, as far as standards of life are concerned, to the school and to the very beginning of school; that it is partly a problem of leadership in the local community, and particularly a question as to whether there can be developed within the community, community consciousness and community coöperation rather than dependence upon help from the outside in putting things through; and that the problem of adult education does very distinctly come into it.

Seemingly we have four items: Education, leadership training, the development of community consciousness and community integration through the adult education. The question of the relation of the church to this was definitely raised in one of the groups in relation to spiritual aspects.

Are there any further suggestions you wish to make on this? Are these the points at which you feel, so far as the standards of life are concerned in the local community, we have to take hold? That is practically the question. Is it at the point of education of young children, the training of certain kinds of leadership for local community, the development of movements and methods by which the community can handle its own life rather than a dependence upon outside agencies that we are to take hold?

*The Extension Service.*

DR. A. C. TRUE: When you speak of education I don't want you to leave out of account that great system of popular education among the farming people which was known commonly as extension work. It isn't merely a matter of school that we ought to consider, as far

as rural education in this country is concerned, but we ought to take definitely into account this great nation-wide system of extension work. With adults, young people and children you must keep in mind that there are more than half a million farm children in the boys' and girls' clubs which have been founded in all our states, and that many of the adult farmers are in clubs and other organizations in more than twenty-five thousand rural communities in different parts of our country. This system has this advantage, which also ought to be taken into account: That the work with the young people and the children is closely tied up with the work with the adult farming people, and we are taking into account also not merely the men on the farms but the women as well, so that we reach in this way the problem quite broadly and quite generally. This extension system, while it is large and nation-wide, has by no means reached its completion, and from my point of view an organization like this ought to be very much interested in spreading that system more thoroughly in the rural communities.

*Do We Have Too Much Community Consciousness?*

MRS. KATHERINE M. COOK (Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.): I was just going to suggest to you that there is a report from the committee on which I worked concerning the standards of life, and I think we had one or two things which you might be interested in adding to this. We all came to the conclusion, I think—and it is very gratifying to me to find that so many people do come to that conclusion—that the thing goes back to education all around, whether it be the education of children or adults, from whatever point of view we attack it.

In this group we had a feeling that the matter of developing community consciousness was sometimes overdone, and that there are many rural communities in which there is too much community consciousness, and that inasmuch as the tendency in all directions is toward larger units of every kind, part of the thing we ought to be considering is this new trend toward larger units and toward centralization of the small units in education and in everything else. We had a good deal of difference of opinion as to what a community is. You are all thinking about different sized communities.

*Community Consciousness.*

PROFESSOR PERRY P. DENUNE: Repeating what Mrs. Cook has said, our group yesterday took up a discussion of standards of life and the relation of that to the community consciousness. We had a very diverse group in Group No. Ten; there were folks from all the various sections of the United States.

We came to these conclusions and these problems: There is no agreement as to what we mean by the community or community consciousness or community spirit. Then there was the question which Mrs. Cook raised as to whether it is desirable to build community consciousness in the local community, the idea suggested being that in so doing we are running counter to national tendencies to centralization and a disintegration of the local community. In view of the trend toward centralization in larger groupings, should the community be encouraged to narrow itself down to its local point of view?

Coming over more specifically to the discussion regarding standards of life and that whole Group II: I don't know whether you have had this morning reports on additions to be made. It was suggested that this proposition, No. II, be re-worded and that it practically be subdivided for adequate standards of living. That may be included as adequate and it may not. It was proposed that (c) under that section be changed in its wording to "Social adjustment"; also that æsthetic satisfaction be included in the elements in the standards of living—æsthetic satisfaction, appreciation of art and so on.

The question was raised as to the possibility of working out a standard of life; that is, we have been talking about standards of life and standards of living, and we have been talking about that standard being different in different parts of the country. The question is whether it is possible to work out a standard of life.

It was also suggested that so far as the standard for a community is concerned, the score-card type of procedure rather weakens, or it may tend at least to stultify the community and make the people satisfied with reaching a goal that is not as high a goal as they should reach. The idea is that such a procedure may work to the detriment rather than the advantage of the community.

*Summary of Discussions.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: The question has been raised as to whether you want to develop a country consciousness, and it has been raised in two forms. It has been raised by the committee as to whether you wanted a country consciousness when it came to the development of standards of education or whether you wanted it to come in with the larger unity consciousness; and it was raised, in the second place, in regard to school and church, whether we wanted a leadership strictly for the country or whether we wanted a school system irrespective of country and city.

*The County Council in Virginia.*

MR. J. H. MONTGOMERY: Several people have asked as to how the County Council operates in keeping local agencies together. I will say, just as briefly as I can, that we are trying to make the County Council really a county-wide clearing house. The general plan for the organization of the Council is for it to be composed of the county officials and the full-time workers in the county; that is, the County Superintendent of Schools, the Farm and Home Demonstration Agents, the Health Worker, the Welfare Worker, and any other full-time worker we have in the county. Then we have the chairmen of the county-wide organizations; that is, the County Board of Public Welfare, the County Agricultural Board, the Teachers' Association, the Bankers' Association, and other organizations. The general plan is, after these are together, to have each organization make a report on its work, what it is expected to do, what it is trying to do. In that way the people discover just what organizations they have and what each of these organizations is endeavoring to do, and also, if any duplication of effort is going on, it enables them to find the areas that are not touched. Oftentimes there are a number of things which are not being done and in all the organizations you will find areas in which they ought to work.

The Community League is a clearing house for the community. All of the organizations may belong to this organization, making one organization in the local community promoting everything for the interest of that community. The County Council is simply an

organization for the leadership of the county in order that this leadership may promote every good cause—not to put on a new program but rather to support the programs of those who are really established to do the agricultural work, those established to do the educational work, the welfare work, the health work, and so on, bringing these leaders together. I might give one illustration which would perhaps indicate that the work is really a serious task and show you a situation in one of our counties a few months ago where a very strong Council found itself confronted with a very perplexing problem.

The Board of Supervisors had proposed to shorten the school term and had proposed to discontinue the demonstration and health work. The County Council and the Bankers' Association made a study of the whole field and made a recommendation with reference to the whole situation. The schools were not closed; the demonstration work is still going on; the health work is going on. One of our state leaders said it was one of the most serious opositions that had confronted that county for years and he did not know what they would have done if these organizations had not been thoroughly coöperating and working together, understanding each other.

MR. C. E. VERMILYA: Are the officials of that organization all voluntary?

MR. MONTGOMERY: Yes.

*Summary of Discussion.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Are we together at these points and have you any other suggestions? We have had two items developed in relation to standards of life. One has been the question of education and it has been suggested very definitely here this morning that there must be changes in education in the country as well as elsewhere in the matter of important life problems for standards of living and economic relations. I am bringing in Dr. Taylor's suggestion of yesterday afternoon. Several said this morning that if we are going to have standards of life in the country it will be because of the fact that the education is dealing more directly with the way people live and with these various questions than it has

been dealing; that somehow or other education must be for the country in relation to the larger life and not simply for the country; that a very large part of the problem is adult education so that the gap between youths and adults will be bridged and so that we will get the willingness of the adult population to open different standards and different ways of looking at things; that all movements are integrally a part of any attempt to solve this problem from the educational viewpoint.

The other type of the discussion this morning has gone along the line of what we call the community consciousness. It has been defined in a number of different ways but it has included seemingly four emphases, and I will be glad if you will add to these if you wish. Over and over again it has been suggested that the initiative is going to come from the local group. Somehow we are going to devolve ways and means in which people actually living in the country can take hold of these problems for themselves. Unless the initiative comes there we will not succeed in solving the problem. It has been said that the outside agencies should come in in the sense of being asked for; not necessarily by somebody sending an S.O.S., but at least that they come in in the relation of helping these local groups as they wished to be helped rather than in insisting that these local groups should adopt this or that. If I got the discussion there was a difference in the temper and attitude of the agencies in the relationship that was set up. There have been one or two differences here and some people felt that these outside agencies would need to stimulate their local demand. The extent to which they should stimulate local demand has been a matter of difference of opinion. I have found no difference as to the initiative; it should come from the community and the outside agencies must be coöperative.

May we add to this set of suggestions about community consciousness what I have marked 1 (a), which has been mentioned several times in the groups—that it is not only a matter of the responsibility being in the local communities but it is a matter of the method by which that local responsibility is developed; that if you come to the community attempting to get them to accept a certain organization you have one relation; that if you come to

the community or if you are in the community studying what that community needs in the way of health, how it can meet it the way other people have done, you have another relationship.

The suggestion has come from two or three gentlemen that we have a new way, a different way, of approach to the community problem; before we take things in from the outside we are now on the inside trying to help find what is the matter, and if a person comes in from the outside he comes to study the local problem with the local people making such resources available rather than coming to the local community with something which he offers to the local community. That makes a radical difference in what happens and in the temper of feeling there.

# THURSDAY AFTERNOON

## (A) Economic Coöperation as a Method of Increasing Income and Raising Standards of Living

Chairman Elliott: It has been suggested by the program committee during the noon period that if we could spend a little time at the beginning of our afternoon checking one other item of method before we did our summarizing together and helping one another on standards of life, it would complete this attempt to find what we can do about farmer's income and standards of life. Therefore, if you have no objections, we are going to spend the first part of the period discussing the coöperatives, which were supposed to have been part of our discussion this morning and which it was not possible to complete. Then we will turn at once to the questions of standards of life and what is involved in an adequate, or, as somebody said this morning, a practicable standard of life for the country.

Dr. Carl C. Taylor: I should like to see the people who are interested in coöperatives start the discussion in exactly the order you have placed it on the board because I think that is the practicable way to get at it. If we can get in the foreground pretty nearly what the distinctive contributions of the coöperatives are then we will have some criteria by which to measure.

### *How Coöperatives May Influence Living Standards.*

Miss Elizabeth Kelly (Raleigh, North Carolina): For the past year or two I have been loaned by the State Department of Education to do community organization work as best I might through the coöperatives because some of us recognize, and I think the ones who are trying to work out coöperative marketing recognize, that standards of life are as much a part of the work of the

coöperatives as income is. In fact, I think if it were not for the fact that we recognize that the standard of life is largely dependent on income we wouldn't be interested in the coöperatives.

Through the years in North Carolina I have ignored too much, as all purely educational associations and as community groups organized by health associations or the various kinds of activities necessary in a community, are apt to do, working on the translation of income through small groups, the fact that higher income is not achieved in small groups. The income is absolutely useless unless it is translated in the best way into life needs, but you can't have a social institution supply all of these life needs in the rural community or any other community unless it is underwritten by income, which must come by large group action.

I believe in education of the children and of the youth, and a lot of these problems will be solved when they are all educated, but you and I will be gone by that time and we ought to do something for the older people who are more capable of real education than the high school boys or girls. They can be educated in small groups and it is the thing that needs to be done. We ought, by some means, to enable each neighborhood to become a self-starter, so that it would be able to step on its own gas and move. If some people in the neighborhood are able to assemble the necessary fuel and start them going you are much better off, but you may have to send somebody from the outside to come in to crank the thing, and the danger is that you will get a crank to do it. As I understand the proposition here it was to be able to point out or send a delegate to crank or to start that community going. I want to tell you that there are plenty of cranks there already that you can use.

In trying to do this particular piece of work in North Carolina I want to tell you how I go about it—just make a personal application of it. I have organized a good many local communities recognizing the fact that that community lives, not for health alone, not for material things alone, not for what the home demonstration agents can do, not for what the preacher does for better churches alone, but that we need all of these. When you get to the point where you have a community consciousness that is intelligent enough to diagnose its own case and find that it needs something in the

way of health, send for the person who can supply that health through the State Department, through the local doctor, or what not.

We do have locals established in connection with coöperatives and these locals were originally established, mind you, just as little business organizations, and discussed marketing and nothing else. Now we are trying to discuss not only the market production but also farm management and the production of home supplies as the sources through which a farmer may, by a combination of all of these studies, expect his income. Then we want to go further in these groups and discuss the best ways of translating that income into life needs through the various institutions there.

To get back to the thing I wanted to say here. I don't want some of you who have the very best intentions and who have studied and studied so much that you have almost drawn a circle around yourself away from all human contact to think you have nothing to contribute. You have something to give. You might not be able to give it direct but you can let me come to you for it if you remain sufficiently human for me to approach you. I imagine that enough of you are wise and will stay within reach of me so I can get at you.

*Educators and Coöperatives.*

MR. JOHN R. HUTCHESON: I noticed about four years ago that almost everybody in meetings of educators in this country wanted to talk about coöperative marketing. None of us knew much about it then but we have gained a good deal of experience in the last four years. I think the most distinctive contribution so far to the educational movement has been the fact that not only farmers but professional people, business people, and other people are thinking about the subject, thinking of other things to do.

The study of coöperative marketing leads us to believe, where it is practiced successfully, that it adds to the farmer's income. We talk about the farmer's income. There are only two ways to increase it: Decrease the cost of what he produces and increase the selling price of what he gets. Coöperative marketing, from the income standpoint, is an effort to increase the price for his proportionate part of the final selling price of the product. The two most prosperous counties are Accomac and Northampton, where coöper-

ative marketing has been fairly successful. They are the two richest counties in the United States in agriculture. The crop values per acre in the United States are greatest in Accomac and Northampton Counties, Virginia. Coöperative marketing has added to the income. If you go there you will find a better feeling among the people and you will find about thirty banks, and you will find a whole lot of other things. But it is the hardest thing to carry on. I think one thing we must remember is that economic coöperation is necessary not only for the income but for the standard of life on the farms of this country.

DR. J. P. MCCONNELL: Dr. Hutcheson has said a good deal and he has said it better than I can. But, from my observation, the whole matter goes back to education. In fact, I sometimes think that an educational worker is very much like the barber who told me that the most hurtful invention of the nineteenth century was the safety razor; he said it nearly ruined his business. That shows how much everybody thinks his business is leaving him. But as Mr. Hutcheson stated, a matter of education is a slow matter, and one contribution I believe this Association could make is this: To caution people to try and be patient with it. Isn't that necessary, Mr. Hutcheson? It takes a long time to try it out.

*Should Not Coöperatives Have a Single Function?*

DR. A. C. TRUE: If you are forming a coöperative organization to do business, it certainly is a question whether that particular organization had better confine itself to the work for which it was organized in order that it may be most efficient in that line of work and let some other kind of an association take care of the more general problems of the rural community. That, as I understand it, in a way is the general policy of the Farm Bureau. The typical Farm Bureau is organized to look out for the general interests of the community to which it belongs. If that community decides to go into coöperative marketing a separate organization is formed for that purpose. I am not saying personally which is the right way, but I simply raise that question because I think it is an important question and it was suggested, of course, by the last speaker with reference to these differences which arise. I doubt whether it will

ever come to pass that an organization formed to market a certain farm product can be the best general organization for the community.

MRS. MARY C. TIPTON: I am from the Burley Association district and I would like to say that I think experience is the only way in which we can be taught. I had a conversation with Mr. James E. Stone just this past week. We have had the Coöperative Burley Association for five years and I, as a farmer, think it is going to fail. He thinks it is not going to fail. But if it does fail, our farmers who are really interested in it will organize again on a better basis.

MR. E. C. LINDEMAN: What do you think the mistakes were?

MRS. MARY C. TIPTON: I don't think any mistakes have been made. I think we have the grandest organization there is, about the best in the United States. I don't think the people appreciate it. They don't know just what it is. It is certainly on a sound basis and if the country people could have patience for five years they would find that it would be just at the point where it should be. But the farmers don't seem to realize that. They are so anxious to pay their debts.

MISS ELIZABETH KELLY: I am keenly interested in the Burley Association. This lady has said that the Burley Association is a good business organization and necessary for the financial prosperity of the agricultural section. Can you all, as representatives of social institutions, afford to ignore your duty toward the cooperatives any more than we can afford to ignore our duty to all of these things? I think that is the point.

*Summary of Discussion.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: If I understand it up to this point, there have been two types of contributions mentioned which we probably all would agree upon. One, of course, is coöperative marketing as a business venture in increasing income, and the other is the educational measure really focusing attention upon education, which I understood was Mr. Hutcheson's idea, and really forming the basis of the thing. There has been a good deal of discussion as to whether the coöperatives are handling other aspects of community life and Miss Kelly has mentioned the relation between the coöperatives and

social agencies—as to what they could do if they were to coöperate with social agencies in other aspects of the community. All of these last three points indicate that this coöperative marketing is a part of the whole question as to whether the farmers can learn to work together on various sorts of things. Do I understand that to be the point of view?

*Community Relations of Coöperatives.*

MR. R. W. GREEN (North Carolina): I want you folks to know some of the things Mr. M. L. Wilson, of the Tri-State Tobacco Growers Coöperative Association, has been doing. I happen to know he has made a definite attempt to coöperate and has gone more than half-way in an endeavor to get other agencies really to cooperate in a community undertaking. He has had some success at this. I believe this body should know that owing to professional jealousies coöperatives do not always meet half-way. I know that conditions vary and such relations as we have in the South are very different. But there is a real point and one I think the social workers ought to keep in mind in regard to coöperatives.

One gentleman spoke of seventy-five meetings in one county in a year. That is absolutely ridiculous. All of the agencies have got to get together and coöperate if they expect the farmer to do anything.

*The Distinctive Contributions of Coöperatives.*

MR. B. Y. LANDIS: As I read this question on the board it says: "What distinctive contributions have the coöperatives to make?" As I sense this discussion I feel that some of the people have been too modest in saying what those distinctive contributions are. If all the evidence were in, I think we should have to conclude that there were not many distinctive contributions. As a student of the coöperative movement, I believe there are more evidences than have been put in.

It appears that there is a fairly definite relation to higher income in some instances. I would like to refer to the studies of Theodore Macklin, who had studied the cheese industry. I think if Dr. Nourse had time last night he would have referred to this study. He

thinks that well organized coöperative marketing has been responsible, perhaps, for increases in prices of about twenty-five per cent over previous prices. It is very hard to isolate coöperative marketing as a factor in giving us higher price levels. For example, we have a situation here in the East of the price level of tobacco in North Carolina, Virginia and South Carolina. It is very evident that the price level since coöperative marketing has gone into effect is certainly at a point higher than previous levels. Some of my economist friends say they are at least morally certain that it has been a factor there and others would go farther than that.

In the next place, there are definite, distinctive contributions, I feel sure, in this matter of the standards of living. We have the work which Miss Kelly described and the work which Mr. Wilson has been too modest to tell about. I want to second the remarks of the man in front of him that he is doing a very important piece of work in this matter of interest in a higher standard of living.

There are, so far as I know, four large coöperatives that are attempting to make a direct contribution doing work such as Miss Kelly is doing.

Then, of course, we have to consider this matter of the indirect relationship. Some of the most famous promoters of coöperative marketing have always claimed that there is an indirect relationship. We have been told that in certain prosperous sections of California, after coöperation had been carried on for a long time, the people acquired a higher standard of living. I think it is a very naïve claim that must not be accepted uncritically. I have been surprised to find educators and social workers accepting it rather uncritically. We must remember a higher net income may go into more productive equipment, or it may help to stimulate high land values, or it may go into a higher standard of living; but it may go into the first two, and frequently it does go into the first two, and higher net income, whether it is due to coöperation or other causes, has frequently gone into those first two. For example, the corn belt is a good illustration of the fact that we have not very great advances in the standards of living but that higher net income has gone into the first two and particularly stimulated that scramble for land values which has brought such disastrous results in Iowa and Illinois.

I think there is this to be remembered with regard to this indirect relationship which is claimed: That where a coöperative is organized and where it produces higher net income, there may come this higher standard of living, if we have stimulation of discussion as to what are higher standards of living, if we set up objectives, if we teach wise consumption. I think Dr. Galpin's teaching in regard to the importance of wise consumption, the importance of spending the old dollar wisely, is very pertinent here.

*Direct Education in Economic Relationships.*

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: I think one of the biggest contributions of coöperative marketing as I get it—I remember having said this from that platform right there and being disputed by presumably the biggest authority in coöperative marketing in the United States—is "direct education" in economic relationships.

We have believed that once we set the coöperatives up as business units they would go as business units and once having set them up as dividend-making machines we would get a higher standard of living. Neither one happened. We see that the coöperatives could not go on as business units without a certain amount of education taking place in the membership of the coöperatives. We have discovered the belief on the part of the people who signed their names on the dotted line that they set up a business organization and that dividends would flow in. They had no knowledge of how the dividends would come or what they would have to do in a business way or any other way to make those dividends. Then a lot of propaganda was put out telling how coöperatives are not the sort of thing that college professors and paid employees tell you they are at all. The farmers immediately got into conflict. Then the cooperatives started field programs. After all it was nothing else but the question of contact, which Miss Kelly spoke of, between the business unit and the personal unit, which is the member himself. Then we started up little business groups in the different communities getting people who were members of the coöperatives. The coöperatives set up locals and said, "We will get our members together?"

"What for?"

"To teach them the business of coöperative marketing."

So they got together and started to teach them the business of coöperative marketing.

The biggest contribution that coöperative marketing has made, whether it lives or dies, is the contribution of letting the farmer know that if he is going to live in a price and market régime he must understand how prices are made and the way markets work, and in addition to that he will make a contribution in community action. That is a distinctive contribution that coöperative marketing is making. It is the biggest thing in the tobacco belt today. The biggest educational institutions have learned more from it than they have learned in their schools and colleges in the last ten years. You can't set up a coöperative as a business unit and disregard the fact that it can't work and the members won't stick unless they understand what it is about.

## (B) THE ELEMENTS IN THE FARMER'S STANDARDS OF LIVING

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: The second item to which we agreed to give attention was the second half of the main issue; namely, the question of standards of living. We are going to ask Dr. Kirkpatrick if he will open the discussion as to what is adequate, or practicable, or reasonable with regard to standards of life, as evidenced by some of his own investigations.

### *The Elements in the Farmer's Standard of Living.*

MR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: I am going to speak for five or ten minutes, not out of my experience, but out of the experience of other people. I am going to do what I can to give you the standards of living on the farm, and I think probably we can get into this thing more specifically by example.

About thirty years ago I happened to know a farm woman who was left, at the age of thirty or thirty-five, with six small children, and twenty acres of land which was still covered by mortgage, or partially so. Shortly after that a group of the neighbors got together and decided that something must be done to pay off the mortgage on that farm for that woman with those children. They did so. This woman happened to have, I believe, about the equiva-

lent of a fifth or sixth grade education, but there was something which, in some way, had made a picture in her mind of a standard of living or a standard of life for that farm family. The first thing she realized was that these children had to be fed. They must have that thing which is considered as the first of the necessities—food. She was able to provide a great deal of that, but occasionally it was provided by the coöperative effort of the neighbors. Then she came to a realization that in some way these children had to be clothed, and she didn't slight that element in the standard of life. Sometimes she got some help. Then she came to a realization in some way that this house in which that family was living needed to be made a little more attractive, made a little bit larger. One or two of the rooms needed to be plastered or ceiled; and she realized that the exterior of that home should be made attractive through the use of shrubs and flowers and so on. She instilled in those children in that farm home the desire for that thing and in some way she got them to help her to make home an attractive and comfortable place in which to live. As the years went on she instilled in those boys and those girls in some way the desire for better furnishings in that home. Occasionally those children would want certain things which, as she saw it, were not for the best advantage of all of their family. She would call them together and say to one or the other, "Now, that is all right. I would like you to have that, but don't we need this a little bit more. Don't we need this thing rather than that thing, which will be a benefit to one?"

As all of this was taking place that woman, in spite of all of her housework and all of the attention she was giving to outdoors, was finding a few minutes in the day before she went to work in the morning and after the children had gone to bed in the evening to read a little bit in her Bible, to read a farm journal, or to read a book, or to read the editorials in her church paper. All of the time she kept instilling into those boys and those girls the importance of getting an education, and those boys and those girls who at first many times had a headache in the morning and didn't care to go to school gradually learned to like school and went to it.

Then there came a time when she seemed to feel that those boys and girls needed some way of getting about in the community and

out of the community neighborhood, as it was called in those days, and so there came, for the use of the boys and the girls and the mother, what was in those days called the driving horse. Gradually there came into that farm family these elements of farm living: Food, clothing, housing, furnishing and equipment, operation goods such as fuel—that is, they were provided in sufficient quantities to keep off starvation and keep that family together; then there was education—four of those children who grew to maturity were school teachers, and two of them went through college and are in respectable positions; there was religion—each one of those children was affiliated with the church; there was recreation—scarcely a week went by but what that mother read to those children or helped them in their games or popped corn or taught them to bob for apples or something of that sort; there were savings—a few, of course, but before that mother died she paid back to her church board the sum of one thousand dollars, five hundred dollars of which she asked to be donated to the children's orphanage, and five hundred dollars to the old folks' home, as they called it. She had no insurance; she was a woman who did not believe in life insurance. But that family living in that home was practically complete.

What have I said about income? Practically nothing. As we have discussed this term "income" I will venture that there are not a half-dozen people in the room who have thought of that income in anything other than dollars. How many have thought of that income in terms other than dollars?

(About eight people raised their hands.)

The question is how to establish a relationship between standards of life and farmer's income. Over on this side of the board we have this coöperation. We have here a list of goods—there might be thirty; if you want to make them such it makes no difference to me, but the point is this: On this board we have represented the elements which go into that standard of living or standard of life. Some of those elements we may obtain with very little coöperative effort. If we have the dollars we can buy the food at the present time; we could twenty or thirty years ago with very little cooperative effort on the part of the people in the locality or the neighborhood. We can buy the clothing, although we do not always

get value for money spent. We can buy certain other items, but let us assume that we want to buy education; we want to buy religion.

How much religion can we buy for one dollar or five hundred dollars provided there is no group action—no group of individuals who have come to the realization that that religion, the essence of religion, the sum substance and sum total of it, is built out of group activities?

If this Association can do nothing more I should be greatly pleased if it could in some way suggest to some college or university or some organization that some one go out and select one hundred of the ordinary farm families, farm homes, in which we find what we believe to be a fairly well-balanced standard of life, and then go out and make a study of how that family came to be where it is. If we can determine the factors which have entered in, the steps by which that family has been able to attain that level which it has—I venture you will find that in every ninety-five of that one hundred no one has a given income to make that standard available. You may find some of these, but it seems to me that that type of family is worthy of study and worthy of attention. If we can search out the best and in some way, out from that best, get into this standard of life the elements of family living, then we will be searching for others and eventually we will get something by which we can define this.

During the past three or four years we have made some attempt to define a standard of living. Bear in mind when I present these figures that I don't hold at all that the dollar measures the standard of life satisfactorily. We have talked standards of living, we have heard those words, I believe, from every one or two people who have spoken at this conference, and we have had no idea or no conception as to what is meant by standards of living or standards of life.

If, for the time being, we can agree that we can measure the standard of living in dollars, that is, the complete picture in dollars and distribution of those dollars, better than we can measure it in anything else, then we can proceed just a bit further with this discussion.

These are the averages coming from the survey records of 2,883 farm families throughout the various selected localities of the United

States. For those families we have found on an average that $1,503 is the value of goods consumed by those farm families during one year's time; or that $619 went into food; $220 to clothing; $187 to rent; about $41 to furnishings. Bear in mind that this is the value of goods purchased for use or obtained for use during that year. Transportation amounts to $209; maintenance of health $59; advancement $94, and that term advancement may be split up into education, recreation, religion, organization dues, and so on; insurance (life and health) $35; unclassified $2.50. Of that $1,503, $644 worth of goods was furnished by the farm. I don't mean to say it was obtained without a payment of money.

Here is the question I have to raise. This whole standard of life or standard of living, of course, as you said this morning, is a matter of education, but education does not mean simply schooling for these children. It means education in general, of course, as has been suggested by Dr. Taylor in connection with the coöperative scheme. We must bear in mind that this whole scheme of family living, standard of life, is nothing more or less than a process of making choices. There is no farm family under the sun who will say, "I have enough income," and there are not many other families that do. I don't say it; you don't say it; but it is a question of making choices. If we want that and we have this the question is, after all, which gives the greatest satisfaction? And in some way we may be of help in the direction of choices.

We have found workers who, when they have taken a summary of the results back to these local people who were kind enough and patient enough to give them the data—when those local people have said, "What does it mean?" those people have said, "We don't know." So it means this: After we have done our research work or whatever it is, we have to put into it that which vivifies or makes it real and vital and of interest to those people who gave it to us. About the only way I see is simply to be ourselves and discuss it thoroughly from the human viewpoint.

*A Matter of Choices.*

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: You mentioned the fact that it was a matter of choices. I should like to ask a question about families

whose total expenditure is a thousand dollars; which of the things do they leave out?

MR. E. L. KIRKPATRICK: That I can answer in a general way only. Of course it is evident that if there were only six hundred dollars on an average, that six hundred dollars would not all be spent for food. There still would have to be a roof over the head of that family, there still would have to be some clothing, and so on, but from the standpoint of proportions, the lower the average here the higher the proportion of that for food. But the cut, in a good many instances, has been in other elements.

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: They came out of what you might classify as the cultural consumption goods?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is a larger proportion of the cultural consumption goods in the families with the larger incomes.

MR. COOPER: The question still lies behind that which seems to be in the mind of every one: "How satisfactory is that standard?"

MR. SWIFT: I understood this to be a standard of living, whereas the subject of discussion was a standard of life, which is so much wider; as far as my observation goes, the one thing this organization ought to do, above all others, is to build in the minds of the rural people a proper standard of life. That was the thing I was trying to bring out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The question is asked, how near average or satisfactory or adequate, at $1,500, the standard might be? To that I should reply that that is about as adequate as we will find in the typical or above typical farm community in Ohio, Kentucky, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, or New York State. The range of costs there per family was anywhere from $500 up to $5,500 or $6,000. But in the majority of those homes, of those families, there were cases which ranged around from $1,000 up to $2,500, and one interesting thing about the figures was the thing I was pointing out a moment ago—as the total increases the larger proportion goes to food, and so far as we can determine the average number of individuals per family remains about the same.

*How Can Choices Be Influenced?*

PROFESSOR L. A. RAMSDELL: Is this the time to raise the question, "Where do we go from here?" May I suggest that I think Dr.

Kirkpatrick has brought us square up to the kernel of the problem when he says that the problem of a standard of living is essentially a problem of choices. In other words, it brings us up to a proposition that the problem of raising the standard of living is the problem of influencing individual choices. That is such a big problem that it makes me sick to think of it, but it looks to me as if that is where we are at. I suspect we have at least two points of view as to the method of influencing individual choices in this matter of the standard of living: There is one group who feel that it can be done on a large scale by some kind of a broadcasting method, and another group who feel that it has to be approached case by case. I don't suspect that either group knows very much about doing this.

*Summary of Discussion.*

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: I understand our situation on this standard of life or living or cost of living to be, first, with reference to the minimum at which people could be fed and clothed, and then as to this question of educational development in relation to choices; that is, the whole basis of intelligence with regard to choices. I find myself, as Chairman, still puzzled as to what is this adequate standard of life. We still have not gotten up to the elements that in any sense seem to be indicative of an adequate standard of life as compared to a reasonable standard, which I think is Mr. Swift's question as to the difference between a minimum standard and what might be called a reasonable standard of life, that which would include not only housing and such things but the other aspects of life. I suppose that is part of our problem which is still left and one with which we will all be struggling in our own community.

MR. SWIFT: I would like to add one thing to Mr. Ramsdell's statement that it is a matter of choice; that raises a question of whether there isn't a certain per cent in every community who have not the power of making the choice? That goes still deeper.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: You mean the power of intelligence?

MR. SWIFT: The power of intelligence, in knowing how to choose.

# FRIDAY MORNING

## THE CONCLUSIONS OF "SPECIAL INTEREST" OR "RESPONSIBILITY" GROUPS

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: Our business in the next hour is to gather up what happened in the small-group meetings. We have had four meetings of responsibility groups this morning. I think we will take them just in the order as they come, and we want to find definitely what was proposed and suggested as a part of our work here together. May I suggest that possibly rather than taking votes or adopting these reports, which are really statements of sentiment or points of view, what we want is that if you have any objections, any modifications, any places that you would change, you will please speak with entire frankness and if you wish to discuss any of these we will discuss them briefly, but in general we will attempt to reflect what happened in the different groups. If you wish to make any additions you will do so. If those who are making the reports want to call upon some person from the group to speak for a moment on any of the points, provided we can do it quite briefly, that would be all right. Mr. Landis, are you ready to report for the group on Coöperatives?

### (A) WHAT ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD COÖPERATIVES MAKE?

MR. B. Y. LANDIS: It was felt in this group that the importance of the market has come to affect the life of rural communities to such an extent that there is an economic basis upon which cooperative action has to be set up, and it is evident that this economic coöperation should be larger than a community basis; it should involve many communities. This includes the development of an occupational class consciousness, which the group regarded as necessary to a certain extent. It was apparent also that in view of the fact that business groups have opposed coöperative marketing that

the rural-urban conflict has been increased; that there appears to be need of educational adjustment between these two groups; and that there was a feeling that we should endeavor to facilitate that adjustment.

In the second place it was felt that coöperatives should have one definite object in view; that the first concern should be higher income; that is, reducing the cost of marketing, rendering more efficient services, and thereby assisting in increasing the income. It was felt that there is a common concern in a region in the sale of the commodity or the commodities of that region, and that perhaps here we have a basis for developing community consciousness and rallying the local forces around the sale of this commodity in a way that it has not been done before. It was felt that in certain sections this feeling was increasing, that there was more coöperation between business and farmer groups in view of this common dependence upon a commodity.

Third, it was brought out that all the things farmers need to know about the market, the problems of marketing and economic relationships, will not be learned unless they get into the market. There are many things about coöperative marketing that cannot be learned in textbooks, therefore it was felt that the endeavor should be to get farmers to join marketing associations and give them a trial, that participation was the best way of learning about them. Direct education was felt to be most effective.

Fourth, it was pointed out, however, that coöperative marketing in certain sections, notably Canada and other sections, had become a success when it was founded upon a long-time educational program in regard to economic relations, in regard to the importance of marketing. It might even be said that coöperation is a process of education. Therefore it was felt that coöperative managers needed to give attention to the education of their members but also to the education of the public, to the education of people who are not directly concerned with marketing. One manager of a coöperative stated that he thought that one of the things that managers had neglected was just this matter of letting the other people know what the coöperative was doing.

Fifth, it was felt that coöperative marketing could not succeed

unless it, to some extent, drew into it all of the interested people; that it should especially establish contacts with the home. It was felt that coöperative marketing would not succeed unless community consciousness would succeed.

Sixth, it was pointed out that coöperative marketing had already had an effect in making the income more orderly and perhaps there would eventually result a more orderly spending; that there would be a relation to the standards of living in spending. It was evident that the coöperatives had a responsibility in calling the attention of people to the importance of translating their income into consumption goods.

Seventh, it was pointed out that one of the great needs is a different leadership; that the leadership of the business world will not suffice in making coöperative marketing a great success; that we need a leadership which not only has technical knowledge of the problems of marketing but also is concerned about social problems, about questions of standards of living; a leadership which will maintain effective contacts with the market and also maintain the good will of the members and be concerned about making a contribution to community life.

*The Rôle of General Farm Organizations.*

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: I should like to add two points, and then I should like to ask one or two people in the group who made the points effectively to make those points here. Dr. Reynolds spoke of the Canadian Wheat Growers Association and of the fact that for twenty-five years there has been an organization of the wheat growers dealing with the general questions of farm welfare and efficiency. Then the question was asked Dr. Reynolds, "If, instead of organizing these farmer organizations twenty or twenty-five years ago, the information and the teaching had been put into schools and this other thing had not been done, which do you think would have been more effective?" Dr. Reynolds said that without question the type of education that the farmers got through their own coöperation was far more effective than that which could be gotten through the schools. This ties in not only the problem of coöperative marketing but also this process of education.

There is one other point I want to emphasize which Mr. Landis brought out—the problem which the coöperatives would have had had not the general organizations preceded them. The Southern coöperatives, particularly, not having had these well unified farmer organizations ahead of them, have found out that their coöperatives are going down; their members are not doing all of the things necessary to make the coöperatives succeed, because even members of the family whose head had signed the contract were not helping to create the public opinion concerning the necessity of the coöperatives. Therefore they had to set up particular types of field organization bringing in women to assist them in helping even the women and the non-members and the employees to understand coöperative marketing. If the farm woman is not satisfied with the merchandising of farm products which brings in part of the payment when the property is delivered and the rest of it later on she says, "If John had gotten all of it now I could have had a new hat." That is creating a continual discord on coöperative marketing. With that kind of talk community coöperative marketing has a very difficult time in succeeding. Therefore the whole community and the whole family, everything goes to make up this sort of education. I should like to have Dr. Reynolds say a word about this class consciousness point which Mr. Landis mentioned.

*Development of Occupational Consciousness.*

DR. J. B. REYNOLDS: Four years ago in the fruit district called the Niagara District on the south side of Lake Ontario and near Niagara Falls, there was started a coöperative association for the selling of the fruit grown in that district. It has failed and among other causes of failure I have attributed it chiefly to the lack of any preliminary education of any sort toward coöperation. Twenty years ago in Western Canada there originated in each of the three Provinces—and I want you to remember that I am speaking in long distances because all that happened fifteen hundred or two thousand miles away from where I was living, but yet I knew about it—farmers' organizations for the purpose of education, opinion and conviction and creating what Dr. Taylor has referred to as class consciousness. Out of that class consciousness and out of the edu-

cation of opinion and sentiment there grew successful coöperative organizations in Western Canada, particularly of course to handle wheat, so that this is the evidence given by an economist student who has prepared a book on the subject of Western Canada cooperatives: That whereas in 1900 the Western farmers knew nothing about the methods and principles of wheat marketing and were entirely the victims of various agencies who handled their wheat from their fields, including elevator companies, banks, and financial organizations—whereas that was the case twenty years ago, in 1924 the farmers of Western Canada owned and managed successfully two of the largest coöperative associations in North America.

That has been the result of the creation of a class consciousness among the farmers for the three great Western Provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Ontario.

(B) WHAT ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD COMMUNITY ORGANIZERS MAKE?

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: May we hear from the group which dealt with community consciousness or community organization? Mr. Howell, are you reporting?

MR. HOWELL: The group which discussed Community Consciousness or Organization in the Community will make four recommendations:

First, on the point of the origin of the community stimulus—whether it should come from the inside or the outside in developing consciousness or community action. The discussion seemed to reveal that inside stimulation was desirable but outside stimulation is often necessary; the important thing is whether the community finds the right way to meet its needs.

Second, the service agencies have as their main function the exchange of experiences. It is important that the community act in solving its own problems after the way is found out; the way is not the important thing. Various groups from Ohio and Virginia, Tennessee, Kentucky, and some other States reported progress in various forms of coöperative or correlated activity, and the conclusion reached there was that there is a movement in America looking toward integration of agencies and work and adjustment in coöperation; that the tendency needs encouragement and better

correlation from this association or the member agencies, and it was suggested that the American Country Life Association act as a clearing house for information in community organization progress.

The third point is in regard to research: It was decided that research is necessary to determine definite, concrete, scientific information to develop standards for measuring progress, and the group asked that the American Country Life Association encourage the use of Government funds in the research activities.

The fourth point is in regard to the development of community consciousness. Perhaps I should explain that a little more fully. In the development of community consciousness can we develop the self-consciousness without making the community self-conscious and egoistic? Can we develop a community consciousness without the community having constantly in mind its relationship to the rest of the world and a distinct consciousness of its part in the whole of society? The conclusion is that we don't know whether we can organize communities without their becoming self-conscious and egoistic. We need more experiments with emphasis laid on the members of the group keeping their minds open to the wider movements, the work of the world and to the measurement of their progress by these wider movements. We recommend that the experiments be fluid and not standardized.

MR. E. C. LINDEMAN: I should like to supplement the last point. The contrast which we had in mind was whether or not, by stimulating communities to self-realization and self-consciousness, we would not tend to make them self-centered rather than self-conscious. Their interest would become so localized that they would overlook the fact that they really are a part of a larger community.

MISS GRACE FRYSINGER: I want to ask the committee if they think there should be emphasis on any one particular line of research?

*Where Should the Stimulus Come From?*

MR. E. C. LINDEMAN: Yes. One of the most specific suggestions was this: We have felt that the ideal of community organization was getting a group constantly meeting, meeting regularly whether there was a problem to solve or not, and the observation was that all of

those forms of community organization died out. You could start them any place; you could run them for two or three years but they all eventually petered out. Therefore, we wanted to know the reason why they died; we wanted researches in the forms and process of community organization; we wanted to find out the reasons of failure.

I think the first point ought perhaps also to be explained a little because there is a semi-scientific basis for that conclusion—that it, the question whether it makes any difference whether the community is stimulated from the inside or the outside is a pertinent question. Everybody discusses it at every community conference, and we have made the naïve assumption that somehow or other there is a spontaneous principle, there is a vital principle, by which communities spontaneously realize their needs and seek to meet them. I made a study of some community projects, mostly in some of the Middle Western and Southern States where I made this classification—projects which were stimulated from the outside, projects which apparently originated from the inside of the community—and then asked the question, from a long-time point of view, which projects succeeded best, which became integrated in the community's life to the best and most effective advantage. The conclusion was that it didn't make any difference at all—those stimulated from the outside had just as good a chance of success as those stimulated from the inside; and that the real difference arose after the community began acting. Whether or not the community had a process within itself for acting democratically was the point at which the difference began.

*The Larger Parish Plan Exalts the Community.*

REV. M. DANA: I was not in this group but I am working very much in line with this creation of community consciousness and the obliteration of community classes on egoistical lines, and it seems to me that the main thing is to get that work in the community to be comprehensive. If I might illustrate: Mount Desert Highlands contains about one hundred square miles. We are just putting on a movement which is going to take in a community meeting of all its interests in northern Maine; we have another where they are

taking in two hundred and fifty square miles in community endeavor. Out in Colorado there is another where there are about one hundred and fifty square miles; geographically they are one big community. By exalting the idea of the community in that large sense we overcome the local, petty jealousies which destroy community action. I think we have to exalt that word "community" into "areal" loyalty —loyalty to an area, a large territory, which may be a little kingdom by itself.

### (C) WHAT ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD EDUCATORS MAKE?

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: We will ask Miss Taylor, Secretary of the Educational Group, if she will report.

MISS TAYLOR: "What should be done about it" in the field of education? The trend of the discussion took the psychological turn beginning with the call from an interested party for the extension of vocational education under the Smith-Hughes bill passed in 1917. The machinery is ready for agricultural and home economics education. Although 3000 centers are availing themselves of the provisions, it would take three hundred and fifty years for the work to reach all places at the present rate of expansion.

The Smith-Hughes program provides for presentation on a community-adjusted basis. Although some consider the work strictly technical it may be made as broad as the need and may be adapted to the desires of the groups interested. The representative of the Federal Board for Vocational Education suggested that the folks in the A. C. L. A. draw up some suggestions for the training that they considered desirable and send them to the Federal Board. He felt that suggestions were welcome and any requests for certain trends in training of the vocational teachers would be listened to. (It was not made plain that the Smith-Hughes bill provides funds and machinery for specifying the kind of training for the teachers of vocational subjects under the bill.) If more economics and sociology are needed for adequate agricultural teaching the opinions should be expressed to the powers that regulate the teacher training.

While the agricultural work was considered as an aid to the increase of the farmer's income, home economics training under Smith-Hughes was stressed as a means of improving the standard of life

by training the women who are the buyers of goods used in the home, in appreciation of the utility and artistic values of commodities.

The general reasons given for slow development of vocational education supported in part by federal grants were: ignorance and suspicion. Two specific difficulties cited were lack of consolidation of schools and fear of increased taxes. The very small school can not hope to have vocational teachers. Only as schools combine and offer larger units can the course of study enlarge under trained leadership. Even though federal funds pay part of the expense, state funds pay at least half. Taxes must be raised from some source.

The suspicion of farmers based on fear of expense introduced a new factor, the extension worker or county agent working under the Smith-Lever bill. Where the vocational education man and the county agent work in the same field the farmer suspects duplication and unnecessary expense. Duplication was denied. There is plenty of room for both. They work well together; examples of coöperation were cited. The possibility of friction was pointed out and emphasis on harmony suggested.

Objections were raised to some of the Smith-Hughes teachers on the grounds that they had only the vocational side but no training in economics and sociology or that they had expert knowledge but no teaching ability. Like objections were made against the county agent who had limited training. Therefore it was recommended that all workers in rural communities should have threefold preparation to qualify for their work on the best plane: (1) technical training along the vocational side, (2) professional training in the methods of teaching, (3) general education in social sciences.

The definite recommendation for action on the part of the A. C. L. A. was for publicity on possible and desirable and available means of extending vocational training. It was suggested that information be sent to all organizations and interests represented and that these in turn pass it on to ever wider groups. Organizations represented by members in the A. C. L. A., the agricultural and religious press were mentioned specifically.

Adult education through part time and evening classes (meaning interval classes at whatever time of day) was noted as a channel of effort through the extension departments. However, gaps, now

unfilled, were indicated. The boys and girls in high schools are provided for, and adult training has been planned but the young person just out of school and not settled in a profession is disregarded. Many boys who leave school early for work in town never should be urged into agricultural courses, someone maintained. The farm has no room for the boy better adapted to the city and industrial labor.

At the point of qualification of teachers and on the question of lack of interest in school work along in the high school years, various persons directed the group to think of the elementary schools. Five sixths of the people of the country stop in the grades below the secondary schools. Therefore the greatest need is to consider the grammar grades. Be conscious of the elementary school, was the plea. The children in some states have no protection from the requirements for schooling up to a certain age for they may be kept out of school during a given year if needed for work at home. Four suggestions were offered as needed points for emphasis: longer school terms, protection against retardation because of allowed absences, better teaching that would put life problems into the elementary schools instead of considering the first grades as periods for sharpening tools to be applied to vital content later, and certification of teachers.

The trend of the discussion passed from secondary education with the emphasis on vocational work to vocational work for younger children and adults through extension departments to elementary schools and back to secondary and higher education as the sources of teacher training. At the end the many points stressed synthesized into the connected problem or endless circle that showed the interrelatedness that made discussion a desirable method by which to consider the question. The logical procedure might have fooled the group in seeing an orderly issue when the field of education is extremely complex.

In the general discussion of the whole group there was some regret manifested that the discussion was limited to school problems and formal programs were called the report on education. The time scarcely allowed unlimited range. In the widest sense all groups were considering education. In the sectional group it was implied

if not expressed that education should encompass all of life and that the school was the whole neighborhood with all of its needs and aspirations.

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: It was definitely felt, I think, Miss Taylor, that the American Country Life Association could help at two or three points—could help in research, the same as Mr. Lindeman has brought out, but it could also help if it would see to it that every agency here represented and every newspaper or type of newspaper, and all relationships with which it had contact, knew some of these things which were exchanged back and forth in the group; I mean in this way: Put the Smith-Hughes possibilities, the extension possibilities, in some sort of form that is usable and readable, and we might really be help there. Are there any questions you want to ask?

PROFESSOR C. E. MEYERS (Pennsylvania): I would like to make just two comments. In the first place, in giving attention to elementary education there is an attitude involved in using the words "equal attention" that I don't like. It seems to me what we want is "adequate attention" for elementary education rather than comparing it with what might be taken in high school education, adult education, etc.

One other point: The question of consolidation as being essential to the giving of vocational training in agriculture was brought out in the report. During a meeting of the Educational Group consolidation was mentioned once before and I objected because it was a highly controversial subject, and also a term, in the popular sense, which has pretty nearly forty-eight different legal definitions and some hundreds of other definitions by individual persons. But let me cite one point in connection with the giving of vocational training in agriculture as defending school organization. Many of the states are giving very effective vocational training in agriculture for boys from the age of fourteen and over, not in connection with any formally organized school but a part-time and evening work organized as such, not connected with any particular school as it is organized today. That phase of vocational instruction in agriculture is increasing very rapidly.

*The Educational Process Versus the Institution.*

DR. CARL C. TAYLOR: I would like to suggest that the point of emphasis, though enlarged on a good many points by such remarks as Mr. Meyers has just made, seems to be institutional education all the way through. I don't think this Association should allow its recommendation on education as a method of solving maladjustments go into the report purely as an institutional affair. Miss Kelly expressed it yesterday when she said that if we wait for it to be done in the schools most of us will be dead before it gets done and therefore we won't see it. That part is not so bad as long as it is done. Dr. Reynolds said this morning on the point I emphasized that we got, out of education to farmers, coöperative action; that the schools couldn't do it, and that a catastrophe would result before it was done. I think, in the main, we will probably find that all the wild strokes we make by political action and organized economic force and so on will be of little use; what we want to emphasize is education as a process of adjustment. It seems to me what we need is the question of the thought process emphasized rather than the institutional process in education.

MISS E. KELLY: I don't see any great necessity of confining the term "education" to the elementary school or even the high school, for that matter. The thing about it is that the school, if you speak of the building or the physical equipment of the school, ought to be used as a clearing house for educating these adult groups too. The point I would like to make is that the adults can come in there and see the things we would like to have them see much better than some of us could arrange for them.

DR. TRUE: The point that I was especially interested in as far as this Association is concerned, speaking of the extension movement, is that it isn't a movement simply to increase production but deals with both economic and social problems in the rural communities; that it reaches in a large measure adults, young people, and children. What we need, as far as that particular phase of work is concerned, is the more complete development in the agricultural community, and this Association can help toward that end by taking an interest in the extension movement and helping it to develop more broadly along economic and social lines.

(D) WHAT ADJUSTMENTS SHOULD RELIGIOUS WORKERS MAKE?

CHAIRMAN ELLIOTT: May we hear from the group dealing with the problem of Organized Religion?

DR. MUMFORD: The group on the subject of organized religion had considerable discussion and reached the conclusion that the main objective or organized religion should be community welfare and not denominational advancement. And to reach that idea of community welfare it was suggested that we approach that problem of adjustment in the same way we approach any other problem of adjustment, and that is by the training of the leadership, that is by getting the leadership together; that the leadership at the present time in general did not emphasize the community welfare idea as the objective; therefore it was a question of training the leadership to a very large extent.

The training of the leadership should be brought about in the first place by national conferences like this. There is great possibility in concerted action on the part of denominational leadership in the United States and Canada, for Canada was represented in this group, toward bringing people together to discuss in groups like this. Coördination must begin in discussion. Then, that statewide conferences and schools should be used as a method—schools that would train from the point of view of agriculture, from the point of view of the community. We might begin with the community conference and work up—have the community conferences as methods of bringing the leaders together. The first step in making any adjustment like this is that the leaders of organized religion themselves get together and see the need of this as the objective rather than denominational advancement.

Then, in the next place, an emphasis was put on the approach to the farmer's income through and by way of the standard of life. It was thought that at this time when some of the economists are turning their attention in this direction, that we must get this approach in the farm organization, in the church and in the school. The farm organization today, I think, in general approaches it from the other point of view—it is, that the income determines the standard of life. "Give us the price and we will take care of the school and church"—that is the philosophy of the farm organiza-

tion in general, I think? I don't believe I am making an unfair statement in regard to that. Therefore, our idea was that the Church has here now perhaps the greatest opportunity in the history of the Church in America to throw its influence largely in the direction, not of technical interpretation of economic problems—that isn't its business—but to interpret the great values of rural life and to throw the emphasis of the farmers in the community upon this side of it, the educational and the religious and the fair play factors, by which the coöperative spirit can be developed and a high standard of life produced, and then all other things will be added to it. In the farm movement, "Man shall not live by bread alone."

*Overcoming Denominational Loyalties.*

REV. ROBERT B. NELSON (Winchester, Virginia): I just wanted to add that as a country preacher the success of my work is estimated by the number of people and the amount of money I can get, and not by the contributions which I make to community welfare. I don't mean that is true of the Episcopal Church alone as a class. I make that statement publicly because that sentiment has been created in the minds of the church goers in this country. What this country needs is not a church whose success is based upon the number of people attending and the amount of money received, but upon its service to the community. May God grant the grace to help us bring that sentiment about.

MR. GILBERT: Our Chairman suggested that I speak a word about the practical application of this discussion and also how this organization can definitely and practically help in the training of this religious leadership so that it will have a community consciousness.

In the organized bodies of the church there have been for some years courses in our theological seminaries and courses in our colleges offering training for rural preachers so that they would have this community consciousness that you are talking about. Could not this organization, and the different welfare organizations that the members of this organization represent, make a great effort to bring advancement in the United States in educating this rural clergy leadership that they may coöperate with you? This organization should have its representatives on those programs to put into

the consciousness and the minds of these young people from which the leadership of tomorrow is to be recruited this new leadership. There is a tremendous field there for you to create through the church leadership in your community, for, after all, folks are religious, and your preacher in your community isn't the only factor usually, but he may be a mighty poor one, and I grant there is a large number of them who do not have the community consciousness at all; yet if you could get that clergy on your side of this proposition you would do one of the biggest things to get your community consciousness developed there so your agencies could come in and help.

The Home Missions Council, that represents twenty-three of these national bodies, puts on, I think, six interdenominational community summer schools for rural pastors and the attendance runs up into the thousands every year. Get your man in on those programs representing your viewpoint. Then, also, the different denominations are starting schools. In the particular denomination that I represent we have had in the summer schools for the last few years over two thousand of our rural preachers. Let this be a clearing house to get your message in there. You can go right down through the list of young people's institutes. I suppose there are fifty thousand people of high school age who attend every summer what we call the Epworth League Institute. That is where our ministers of tomorrow are coming from—that fifty thousand attending the Epworth League Institute. Get your man in there.

# SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS

The discussions of the eighth national country life conference, on the topic "Needed Readjustments in Rural Life Today," opened on Tuesday morning with the preliminary meeting of a group of leaders, a part of which served later as a program committee. This group of almost sixty persons spent the first day in exploration for the maladjustments in rural life, in formulating matters of concern to rural people today. This was a strenuous sifting process, which, beginning *de novo,* resulted by evening in orderly findings of suggested questions for the entire conference to consider. The topics thus "pounded out" were arranged by the group in the order of their importance, as follows:

I. *Farmer's Income*—The farmer feels he has not a net income comparable with other groups, that he cannot afford things which other people afford and which he sees urban people have, and that he cannot buy what he needs, not to speak of what he would like to have. While he wishes certain developments in country life, such as good roads and better schools, which are dependent upon taxation, he considers high taxes as the second greatest of his business hazards and a distinct problem in securing an adequate income. He would like to see the taxes lowered and yet he recognizes the necessity of taxes as essential to improvements in the country community.

How can the farmer secure an income sufficient to meet his legitimate needs and desires?

(a) How can he handle to a better advantage the income he now has? If he did this, would he have enough?

(b) What can be done by better processes of marketing to increase the farmer's income?

(c) How can taxation be made low enough so it is not a business hazard and yet high enough so that it pays for the legitimate needs of a growing community? What political action is necessary to secure equitable tax adjustments?

II. *Standards of Life*—Certain things not before considered of importance in a well-balanced life have now come to be looked upon as essential. New wants have been created.

As never before, people in the country are seeking to adjust country life so that it will meet more nearly what is considered an adequate standard for health and sanitation, for the education of their children, for recreation and for the development of religion.

How can those in the country determine what is essential to a balanced standard of life?

How can a more nearly adequate standard of life be achieved for individuals and families in the country in:

(a) Health and sanitation
(b) Education
(c) Dealing with problems of delinquency and dependency
(d) Recreation
(e) Religion.

III. *Relation of Farm Groups to Other Groups*—Improved methods of communication and increased contact with the larger social areas have made adjustments necessary. The farm group is involved directly with other groupings in transportation, in marketing, and in credits. Some basis of coöperation is necessary in recreation, education and religion. The farmer cannot make himself felt most effectively in national politics except as he coördinates his efforts with other groupings. How can the necessary adjustments between the farm group and other groups be made most effectively?

IV. *Integrating Country Life*—There are two types of integration needed in country communities. Some communities that are closely in touch with the larger social areas have lost their local community consciousness and their ability to function as a community. They tend to be lost in the city. Other communities are still narrow in viewpoint and out of contact with the developments that are taking place and they lack in leadership and in progress. There is an uneven development as between various country communities.

How can the country community be sure not to lose its local community consciousness when it has these wider contacts?

How can the country community develop within itself adequate facilities for health, social welfare, recreation, education and religion?

V. *Adjustment of Agencies*—Various agencies are found in the country community, giving attention to health, recreation, education, social welfare and religion. The duplications and relationship between these agencies form one of the problems of adjustment.

How can duplications be eliminated?

In what way can these agencies be adjusted one to the other for the most effective service in the country community?

How can social and economic agencies coöperate?

VI. *Political Adjustments*—The trend from centralization of function in the federal government toward decentralization raises certain problems for the farm group. This political tendency comes at a time when the farmer has to some extent lost faith in his own organizations. The farm bloc as an effort to secure occupational legislation has not proved effective.

How can the farmer make himself effective in national politics and in relation to his own interests?

VII. *Attitude Toward the Country*—There is a certain attitude toward the farmer as a "hick." There is a feeling of superiority in the city, and a feeling of inferiority in the country. These include both the attitude of the farmer toward himself and the country, and the attitude of those outside of the country. The farmer feels that nobody understands him.

How can we deal successfully with the present attitude of the farmer and the present attitude of the city toward the farmer and farm life?

(a) Is it or is it not true that farming and farm life are disadvantageous? Is farming an altruistic undertaking?
(b) If farming is now as advantageous as other types of life, how can we correct this false attitude?
(c) If farming and farm life are disadvantageous, how can they become self-respecting and attractive?

The vote of those assembled indicated that the first two matters

were considered of major importance; there was a moderate amount of interest in III and IV; and very little in the remaining three.

By decision of the group of leaders comprising the program committee, there was first of all, on the opening of the conference discussions on Wednesday morning, a preliminary statement as to the purpose of the conference: that it was assembled as a conference to which every one might contribute of his views and experience; that instead of a fixed program, the order of procedure during the following days would be determined largely by what was on the minds of those assembled; that a certain number of experts who had made special studies of topics would be available for consultation and would present data as requested by the conference.

The next step was to divide the conference into small, "cross-section" groups; with the suggestion that each of the groups (1) decide which of these seven topics was of major importance and analyze the main issues involved in it; (2) analyze a second topic assigned to it; and (3) present a written synopsis of the deliberations through a recorder to the full assemblage.

These groups soon got down to business and proceeded to the analysis of the chosen and assigned topics. In a majority of the groups there was full and free participation; in some every person took part. Following is a sample report of a group which considered the topic of farmers' standards of life:

"The group participated freely in the discussions, all but one or two persons taking part.

"There was a universal feeling that the farmers were concerned about the agencies that were trying to push them toward a higher standard of life; that they resented the methods of some agencies because they loaded heavy burdens upon them; and on the other hand that many farmers are not thinking about methods of getting better standards at all—they are up in the air about the matter. Farmers frequently don't know what the agencies are about and after a project has been started they throw it over. Lack of money is troubling the farmers. They have frequently no money for necessities, not to mention the higher wants.

"The main solution was thought to be a system of education which would set up objectives for a high standard of living; of

getting an agency which would approach the matter from the point of view of developing tastes and desires; of changing the national state of mind which accepts the promotional agency which is simply trying to put the thing across. The agencies have been propaganda organizations. The problem now is to educate so that the community will engage in self education and discovery. . . ."

The program committee decided that on Wednesday afternoon the entire conference should consider the questions raised under topic I, farmers' incomes. The small groups reported their findings and there was an earnest discussion throughout the session, with the "searching mood" very evident and with some "floundering." In the evening Clarence Poe and E. G. Nourse were asked to comment upon the discussions of farmers' incomes and to throw in data which they thought pertinent to the solution of the problems. The first part of Thursday morning was given over to reports from the small groups which had considered the question of farmers' standards of life.

After this discussion, it became evident (1) that the solution of the first two interrelated problems—farmers' incomes and standards of life—were considered as of most importance and the chief ends of those assembled; and (2) that the other five were considered as methods or means to achieve those objectives. Attention was thus directed to the importance of the integration of community life and of new ventures in education, and for the rest of the morning the conference grappled with these two matters. In the afternoon coöperative marketing as a means of affecting income was fully considered; and in accordance with a suggestion from the floor E. L. Kirkpatrick presented data summarizing some of his studies of the itemized expenditures of 2,800 farm families.

The next discussions took place on Friday morning, which was the last session. At this time the conference came to grips with what they were going to do about the matters raised, to present their conclusions as to the adjustments they would seek to bring about during the next few years. For this purpose the conference divided into four "interest" or responsibility groups: those interested in education, community integration, religious work, and coöperatives. After two hours of deliberation, these groups reported to the

full conference in what was perhaps the most significant meeting of all.

The group on coöperatives reported as follows: "It was felt that the importance of the market has come to affect the life of rural communities to such an extent that there is an economic basis upon which coöperative action has to be set up.

In the second place, it was felt that coöperatives should have one definite object in view—that the first concern should be higher income, that is, reducing the cost of marketing, rendering more efficient services, and thereby assisting in increasing the income.

"Third, it was brought out that all the things farmers need to know about the market, the problems of marketing and economic relationships, will not be learned unless they get into the market. There are many things about coöperative marketing that cannot be learned in textbooks, therefore it was felt that the endeavor should be to get farmers to join marketing associations and give them a long trial, that participation was the best way of learning about them. Direct education was felt to be most effective.

"Fourth, it was pointed out, however, that coöperative marketing in certain sections, notably Canada and other areas, had become a success when it was founded upon a long-time educational program in regard to economic relations, emphasizing the importance of marketing. It might even be said that coöperation is a process of education. Therefore, it was felt that coöperative managers needed to give attention to the education of their members and also to the education of the public.

"Fifth, it was felt that coöperative marketing could not succeed unless it, to some extent, drew into it all of the interested people; that it should establish contacts with the home, for example. It was felt that coöperative marketing would not succeed unless a community consciousness would be achieved.

"Sixth, it was pointed out that one of the great needs is a different leadership; that the leadership of the business world will not suffice in making coöperative marketing a great success; that we need a new type of leadership, one that not only has technical knowledge of the problems of marketing but also is concerned about social problems, about questions of standards of living, a leader-

ship which will maintain effective contacts with the market and also maintain the good will of the members and be concerned about making a contribution to community life."

The group on community organization—or integration, or consciousness—reported as follows: "First, on the point of the origin of the community stimulus—whether it should come from the inside or the outside in developing consciousness or community action. The discussion seemed to reveal that inside stimulation was desirable but outside stimulation is often necessary; the important thing is whether the community finds the right way to meet its needs.

"Second, the service agencies have as their main function the exchange of experiences. It is important that the community act in solving its own problems after the way is found out.

"The third point, with regard to research: It was decided that research is necessary to determine definite, concrete, scientific information to develop standards for measuring progress, and the group asked that the American Country Life Association encourage the use of government funds in the research activities.

"The fourth point is in regard to the development of community consciousness. Perhaps we should explain that a little more fully. In the development of community consciousness, can we develop the self-consciousness without making the community egoistic? Can we develop a community consciousness without the community having constantly in mind its relationship to the rest of the world and a distinct consciousness of its part in the whole of society? The conclusion is that we don't know whether we can organize communities without their becoming self-conscious and egoistic. We need more experiments with emphasis laid on the group keeping their mind open to the wider movements, the work of the world, and to the measurement of their progress by these wider movements. We recommend that the experiments be fluid and not standardized."

The findings of the educators were: "First, that equal attention be given to the elementary school along with the others, and that the work in the elementary school should not be a preparation for future schools but should actually take up these questions of economics, of home, and of citizenship, which we ordinarily thought of as belonging to the secondary school. At one point statistics were given that

the majority of our people were being educated in the elementary schools, so if we paid no attention to these questions which had to do with economics, and home life, and citizenship in those schools, future men and women would get none of them.

"Second, that under the new Smith-Hughes Act the difficulty has been: first, in information about the facilities that are available; and, second, in getting teachers who had both the agricultural training and this larger training in citizenship and so on—a need of that combination; third, a definite recommendation for coöperation, or the recognition of the need for coöperation between the Smith-Lever people working under that Act and those working under the Smith-Hughes Act.

"Third, on adult education, the feeling was that unless the possibilities of adult education were followed equally with the others, we would lose considerably in the total because of the persons who were not being trained. And there was a definite request in regard to the training of teachers that they should have not only the training in regard to the agriculture or home economics, but these other items."

Those with responsibilities in religious work came to this conclusion: "That the main objective of organized religion should be community welfare and not denominational advancement. And to reach that idea of community welfare it was suggested that we approach that problem of adjustment in the same way we approach any other problem of adjustment, and that is by the training of the leadership, by getting the leadership together; that the leadership at the present time in general did not emphasize the community welfare idea as the objective; therefore it was a question of training the leadership to a very large extent.

"That would be the first method to be recommended as a proper approach to this problem—the training of the leadership; and this should be brought about in the first place by national conferences like this, and that through the denominational leadership in the country, in the United States, more of the leaders should be brought to this meeting, to this Association, annually.

"Then, in the next place, an emphasis was put on the approach to

the farmer's income, for example, through and by way of the standard of life. . . .

"Therefore, our idea was that the church has here and now perhaps the greatest opportunity in its history in America to throw its influence largely in the direction, not of technical interpretation of economic problems—that isn't its business—but in the direction of interpreting the great values of rural life and to throw the emphasis of the farmers in the community upon this side of it, the educational and the religious and the fair play factors, by which the coöperative spirit can be developed and a high standard of life produced, and then all other things will be added to it. In the farm movement, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.' "

Thus came to an end another very significant "A. C. L. A. experiment" in seeking for methods to improve upon the established convention program. E. C. Lindeman gave this interpretation of the last meeting, when the unfolding process of the days spent together was yielding real fruits: "I had a feeling this morning that in our little group—and I have it here now—at last, out of many of these confusions, and sometimes differences which amounted to antagonistic feeling, there is being born in this group a desire to be not only friendly with each other, not only to understand and comprehend all of the various points and approaches, but there seems to be in this group now, there seems to have developed in the last four or five hours, a really spiritual kind of unity. If we only had the time now, I think we could do something quite glorious, quite adventurous, quite new and fresh for the American Country Life Association."

The foregoing is a very "sketchy" account of the Richmond Conference, and must not be taken as an adequate statement. The full report of this very interesting venture must be sought in the proceedings which are to be published. Likewise, the appraisal which follows is very inadequate and is only presented to indicate some suggestive leads for consideration in the future.

It is very evident, to begin with, that there is a division of opinion as to the value of the discussion methods which have been followed during the past two conferences. There is a group which would probably discard experimentation altogether and which regards dis-

cussion methods as futile. There are others who favor discussion but who are dissatisfied with the results thus far achieved.

Five things have been told the writer by those who are fairly well satisfied with the Richmond Conference or who are fairly completely "sold" on the value of the discussion method:

(1) That the unfolding process of the conference was particularly interesting and that the last meeting marked a high point in co-operative truth-seeking. The development of the discussion from an examination of situations, an exchange of points of view in regard to them, the analyses of the issues involved, to the concrete proposals as to what was to be done about these matters was considered very rewarding.

(2) That there was a much higher degree of participation than in the ordinary convention.

(3) That the conference method used gave to all those who desired to do so the opportunity to contribute out of experience.

(4) That this high degree of participation and the opportunity to contribute stimulates thinking and searching in a different way than the ordinary convention.

(5) That the difficulties which have arisen can easily be overcome, that the necessary changes and improvements can easily be made.

Among adverse criticisms the following appear to be most worth noting:

(1) That the topic was bad for a discussion conference, that there was too much time spent in delimitation, elimination or definition.

(2) That the American Country Life Association has not yet definitely determined what its annual conference is to be and do.

(3) That the Association has not yet furnished the conditions for a real demonstration of the discussion method: *e.g.*, preliminary meetings, training of leaders, clear agreements as to function and procedure when we are "on the ground."

(4) That the annual conferences are such heterogeneous groups that a real discussion council cannot be organized.

(5) That too many people attempt to play the double rôle of

critic and participator; and too many others the rôle of both critic and non-participator.

(6) That after the experiences of both Richmond and Columbus the rôle of the expert in the discussions needs to be more clearly determined; that new methods of making relevant facts available might be tried.

# CRITIQUE OF THE DISCUSSIONS

E. C. Lindeman

## Part I

This analysis addresses itself to the query: "What happened at Richmond?" In order to be of the greatest value, a critique of this sort—the reactions and rationalizations of one person—should be supplemented by the appraisals of numerous other observers and participants. I attempted to play the rôle of participant observer during the conference—a rôle which changing circumstances altered. At times I became much more the participator than the observer and vice versa.

Before analyzing the procedure of the conference itself, it seems advisable to visualize the setting in which the discussions took place. The size of the group varied considerably. Not more than sixty participants made one of the liveliest sessions; occasionally the attendance reached two hundred or more. The group consisted for the most part of specialists: economists, sociologists, extension workers, teachers, social workers, preachers, journalists, investigators, officials of coöperative marketing organizations, representatives of farmers' organizations (such as the Grange), representatives of the Y. W. and Y. M. C. A., and a few scattered farmers, farm women and college students. Approximately one-third had attended two or more previous meetings of the American Country Life Association. About one-fifth were in attendance at the Columbus conference of last year when the discussion method was first attempted.

The general theme of the conference was "Needed Readjustments in Rural Life Today." Although several efforts had been made to secure a small group to discuss this theme in advance, it was presented to the preliminary conference group in the form stated above.

The preliminary group of selected persons, numbering about twenty-five, met at Richmond on the day prior to the opening of the Conference. Its function was to delimit the topic, specify problems in terms of (a) Immediacy, (b) Significance, and (c) discuss the particular or unique functions of the A. C. L. A. Seven problem-situations emerged from the discussion:

1. How can the farmer secure an income sufficient to meet his legitimate needs and desires?
2. How can a more nearly adequate standard of life be achieved for individuals and families in the country?
3. How can necessary adjustments between farm groups and other groups be made most effectively?
4. How can the rural community integrate within the sphere of its local interests and at the same time maintain wider contacts with the larger community?
5. In what way can service agencies be adjusted to each other for the most effective service in the country community?
6. How can the farmer make himself effective in national politics in relation to his own interests?
7. How can we deal successfully with the present attitude of the farmer and the present attitude of the city toward the farmer and farm life?

Problems 6 and 7 gradually dropped out as it became manifest that interest centered chiefly in the following:

1. Farmers' income
2. Standard of life
3. Community integration
4. Coördination of agencies

When the larger group assembled on the succeeding day it was presented with a mimeographed outline of the seven topics mentioned above.

*Procedure.*

Following a general discussion, the assembly divided into seven smaller groups; this assured some discussion for all of the seven

topics determined upon by the preliminary group. Leaders from these smaller groups later reported to the conference as a whole and from this time onward discussion was concentrated on the four subjects listed above. Three addresses were delivered to the whole group at this juncture, although not in succession: one on the general economic situation of agriculture by Dr. Nourse, one on aspects of farmers' incomes selected by Dr. Poe, and one on the farmer's standard of living by Dr. Kirkpatrick.

The last day of discussion was devoted to the query, "What can we do about it?" or ways and means. Since this was intended to be a functional treatment of the subject, the group was divided according to interest; thus four groups were organized:

(a) *Educationists,* or those whose functional interests centered predominantly on educational means.
(b) *Religionists,* or those whose primary concern revolved about religious and ethical means.
(c) *Community organizers,* or those who were chiefly involved in methods of providing conscious control of social action.
(d) *Coöperative marketing officials, members or experts;* those interested primarily in economic means.

The period of discussion for each of these functional groups was approximately one and one-half hours, after which they returned to report to the total assembly. The final discussion, also involving 1½ hours, was devoted to acceptance of these reports and general modification through discussion.

*Criticism.*

I. The subject for discussion was patently too general. Too much time was devoted to the mere process of defining and limiting. However, the preliminary group accomplished this task with more despatch than might have been expected. (This group was supposed to be a "sampling" of the larger group but as a matter of fact amounted to something more than a "sample" inasmuch as it included those who are considered to be on the "inside" of the A. C. L. A.'s affairs.)

Studied in the light of history, the theme of the conference possessed a distinct significance. In 1918, when the A. C. L. A. was organized, discussions centered upon the topic: "Objectives in Country Life." This conference staked out the area of problems with which the Association was to concern itself. The current theme, "Needed Readjustments in Rural Life Today," might have been considered as a check on these earlier assumptions and aims. That is, an attempt might have been made to review the history of the Association in the light of the problems which it set out to influence in order to determine what achievements had been made and failures encountered. With this historical background before it, the Conference might have devoted its attentions to those elements of its program which stood out as current unadjustments or maladjustments. The Richmond conference might then have been appraised, not as an attempt to concentrate on a single problem as has been done at all other conferences (save the first), but rather to re-survey the field and determine where future emphasis should be placed.

*Suggestions.*

Inasmuch as the procedure mentioned above was not followed at Richmond, it is suggested that a smaller continuing group be asked to perform this task during the coming year. The value of this process would lie largely in the assistance which such discussions would lend to the selection of future topics for annual conferences.

The discussions at Richmond tended always toward abstractions rather than actual situations. Occasionally participants followed some good example by furnishing experiences but these were too rare to give the discussion as a whole a continuing aspect of reality.

In order to equip the participants with a better understanding of their function in discussion, it is proposed that the standing committees of the Association be reorganized. Formerly they were requested to come to conferences with reports and recommendations; it is now suggested that they come with facts and experiences.

*Illustration:*

Assuming that the topic for the next conference is to be "Rural Youth," might it not be feasible for, let us say, the Committee on

Community Organization to come prepared with such facts and experiences as the following:

a. Illustrations of the part young people have played in some community enterprises.
b. Illustrations of programs, etc., for youth in older farm organizations such as The Grange, Farm Bureau, etc.

Much time would be saved at conferences if prior mobilization of factual material were in hand. Pedagogically it is of course true that facts receive their best treatment in discussion if they are made available at the time of need. I can see no objection, however, in the proposal to envisage some of the relevant facts in advance. If participants could be supplied in advance with a small leaflet containing selected facts, it seems that discussions might proceed with greater facility.

Discussions in the smaller groups suffered considerably from the fact that the group leaders followed no general procedure. Some of them were of course chosen on the spot and could not therefore have prepared themselves adequately for the task. Since discussions in the larger group invariably and inevitably tend to become more general, emphasis should be placed on the smaller groups. The larger group in reality tends to serve the function of giving assent or dissent to the conclusions of the smaller groups, and this is probably its true function. If they recognized this as their contribution, we might expect a wider participation. In the smaller groups it was possible to secure general participation but in the larger group the average participation was exceedingly small. One critic insisted that not more than twelve people did most of the talking and all of the directing in the larger group. This may have been true of some of the earlier discussions but during the process of one of the later discussions I counted twenty-eight participants out of a total number of approximately one hundred and forty.

A process of training discussion-group leaders should be set up in advance of the annual conference. While no arbitrary apportionments can be valid, it seems advisable to establish some ratio between the amount of time devoted to small group discussions and that spent as a total conference. If the functions of the two types

of groups are defined, it seems possible to fix this ratio somewhere in the neighborhood of two to one, i.e., two hours of smaller-group discussion for every hour of total-group discussion.

Considerable confusion resulted at Richmond from the mere fact that participants were constantly attempting to act two rôles: that of participator and that of critic of the method of discussion. There never was a time when the group as a whole entered into the discussion with its mind free from the inhibiting influence of critical attitudes toward the method. Therefore it is of course absurd to speak of the Richmond conference as a test of discussion methods. A real test can occur only when the whole group enters into the spirit of discussion with its attention riveted upon the matter being discussed.

Inasmuch as the A. C. L. A. is definitely experimenting with conference methods, it seems advisable to appoint a methodology committee whose function will be to watch the process, analyze it, criticize it and make continuing suggestions for improvement. If the representatives present knew that this process was going on, they might feel themselves relieved of this function. It goes without saying that such a committee would be in constant contact with the discussion leader in charge of the conference. This committee might also furnish members of the Association with occasional instruction material dealing with discussion methods with a view of maintaining a continuous educational process.

The use of experts in discussion is still a matter deserving extended trial and experimentation. At Richmond a lingering respect for the expert as a public speaker was felt. Both the audience and the experts were worried at times—the audience because it wanted the expert to get a fair hearing, and the expert because he never quite knew whether what he had prepared to say was likely to fit the discussions or not.

Experts should be invited only on condition that they remain throughout the period of the conference. Instead of preparing speeches in advance, they should hold themselves in readiness to supply facts when needed.

Much of the dissatisfaction caused by discussion method results from a feeling that adequate steps have not been taken in advance.

Thus at Richmond there evolved what may humorously be called a "know-nothing" philosophy. Certain persons frequently halted discussion by insisting that they and the discussers did not know enough to discuss the particular question under consideration. Perhaps it is one of the peculiar functions of discussion to reveal the gaps in knowledge. At any rate, the protagonists of discussion methods might very well insist that the revelation of ignorance is one of the creative purposes of discussion.

The A. C. L. A. is a heterogeneous group which in the past has been held together by what may be called a spiritual bond of idealism. Their common philosophy of humanism has never been accepted by the main currents of agricultural leadership. They constitute a minority and as such lack the unifying cohesions which come from power. On the contrary, their unity has rested largely upon an abiding faith. The annual conference has in the past served as the means for renewing and refreshing that faith. The source of this unifying, reinvigorating influence has been usually some brave word spoken or some heartening experience shared by some individual gifted with the capacity for summing up in himself a group's aspirations. However valuable these moments of new solidarity and enforced ideals may have been, it cannot be doubted that they lacked, because of their individual creation, the qualities of permanence and progressive advance. The problem remains, however, of discovering some better means of performing this task.

## Part II

The actual process of group discussion involves such factors as suggestion, imitation, prestige et cetera, that is, the elements of inter-group stimulation and response. A single observer who was at the same time a participator could not, obviously, undertake anything approaching a measurement of these factors, and the following analysis should be corrected by differing points of view. Since discussion aims to utilize to the full the critical capacities of participators, it becomes necessary to observe closely what happens when suggestion and prestige tend to make the situation less objective. It frequently occurred at Richmond that the participators appeared to

be more anxious to "finish" a phase of discussion than to get at its meaning and significance. In these periods, critical capacities were lowered and the responses became largely submissions to authority. At other times a subject which seemed particularly important to the leader or to a small number was not responded to with zest or interest by the larger group and consequently was left "hanging in the air."

The above observations lead to the conclusion that one may expect a discussion-group to pass through various moods or mutual attitudes which need to be understood if improved results are to be anticipated. Viewed in this manner, it may be said that the Richmond group experienced four types of mood. Analysis of these phases or moods should proceed with caution since categories tend to express a definiteness which is not felt in actual experience.

1. In the beginning the group appeared to be non-critical in so far as subject-matter was concerned. It was, moreover, decidedly hesitant, uncertain and vague in its responses. As a result the influence of the leader or chairman and a few others who had given some previous thought to the theme was predominant. Some participators dimly recognized this and during the intermissions they expressed their feeling—sometimes in terms of criticism and sometimes as criticism of the method. Criticism of the discussion-leader was never sharply distinguished from criticism of the method. For the most part, the censors of the leader confined their strictures to the fact that he was not adequately informed regarding rural affairs. In one sense this should have been viewed as a favorable asset, for if the leader were one of the rural specialists of the group, would he not, consciously or unconsciously, strive to maneuver the questions in such manner as to allow his particular interests and points of view to predominate? Would it be possible for an interested specialist to so conduct the discussions as to permit the fullest possible expression of divergent views?

Prior to the conference it was proposed that two discussion leaders should preside—one who was primarily concerned with the method and one who was acquainted with the group and shared its information and interests. Experiments of this sort have been attempted but with varying and doubtful success.

The A. C. L. A. is now engaged in experimenting with conference methods; at this particular juncture, which is more important, emphasis upon method or upon subject-matter? These are questions which demand consideration. So far as the observer could learn, the earlier criticism of the leader gradually evaporated as the meeting progressed.

2. The second phase or mood may best be represented by the term "confused." Participators were perplexed and consequently passed through a period of disordered thinking. They had confused notions regarding the purposes and functions of the cross-sectional groups; some were concerned lest their favorite interest should be slighted; some were confounded by the complexity and scope of the problems left for discussion; some felt that none of the subjects was sufficiently demarcated for purposes of fruitful discussion.

While some disorder of this sort is probably inevitable, it appeared that the chief contributing causes in this instance were (a) a sense of hurry and (b) lack of direction and specific instruction by those in charge of the conference. A third cause—one which underlies all of this analysis—was that many so-called participators obviously did not come to the conference with an open-minded desire to give the method a fair trial.

The period of confusion tended to heighten the feeling of specialist solidarity. During this phase special-interest groups began planning for separate meetings. They seemed to feel an institutional or occupational responsibility for returning to their respective positions with something done or said in terms of their specialities. This of course tended to lessen their participating and coöperating worth to the conference.

3. The third period was marked by a return to or re-expression of critical attitudes. Some wanted to "go through" some specific problem; some thought the entire question had been misstated and needed to be restated; some longed for the voice of authority and direction; some, carrying criticism to its limits, insisted that no one knew enough to discuss intelligently any of the topics before the conference.

On the whole this was a helpful mood since it led directly to sustained interest in objective standard of living factors. It also

prepared the group for a much livelier participation in the smaller groups which met to discuss ways and means. With the exception of those who refrained from active participation throughout the conference, all members seemed to attack their problems with renewed zest and vigor. And this critical attitude produced what the observer at least believes to be worthwhile conclusions and proposals in these final discussions. In addition it served to bring into the discussion numerous persons whose continuing critical attitude had thus far kept them on the margins.

4. The final phase marked the beginnings of what may be called a creative mood. Unhappily the reports from the smaller groups had to be prepared in great hurry and they were inadequately discussed. But even in the light of hastily-prepared reports necessarily relayed without enthusiasm, a distinct feeling of achievement arose. Had there been time to allow this mood to evolve and develop—to display itself—a majority of participants would have doubtless departed feeling that they had coöperated in a creative process.

A summary of these various moods of the conference leads to the conclusion that each phase might have been capitalized and constructively utilized if time had permitted.

## Part III

Underlying the discussion method is the assumption that thinking begins when problems which demand decision are confronted. The process of thinking is assumed to pass through the stages of Discrimination, Conflict and Integration. *Discrimination* specifies the problem, marshals the pertinent facts and points toward the values involved in prospective or potential solutions. *Difference* or *Conflict* arises significantly as discussion proceeds to the level of problem-solving. It then becomes apparent that a group decision will make necessary a change in habits and points of view. *Integration* aims to dissolve the merely temperamental differences while it resolves the significant differences—not by elimination but by interpenetration, assimilation, validification.

The above cycle or process has been variously stated (Thesis,

Antithesis, Synthesis: Hegel), (Analysis, Discrimination, Integration: Holt), (Problem, Principle, Program: Dewey), and is fairly understood and accepted as a mode of conference. As a guide to method in actual conference, however, this process should be further scrutinized. It should be re-appraised and interpreted in the light of particular conferences. Thus a conference of executives (persons responsible for the administration of functional organizations) will meet with its problems fairly-well defined. The aim of such a conference is to learn what to do next. The American Country Life Association does not meet as a body of executives. As a matter of plain fact, its precise character and functions have never been defined. Before it can profitably utilize a method of conference, it will need to clarify its purposes, and there are reasons for believing that experimentation with discussion-methods may be the very instrument for this achievement. Members and officers of the Association have retained a lingering hope, which the actual development contradicts, that real farmers might sooner or later come to be a dominant factor in the organization. But the Association exists on behalf of country life, i.e., on behalf of farmers. If farmers are not present to direct and determine the results of conference, obviously the decisions made are not those upon which the persons concerned are expected to act. They are, as a matter of fact, secondary decisions—made by one set of persons on behalf of another set of persons and with the presumption that the primary persons (those whose behavior is to be overtly altered) will be influenced thereby. In short, the decisions reached by the A. C. L. A. (aside from those of internal character affecting its own administration) while in conference are not executive decisions. The persons who coöperate in making them are under no compulsions to alter their behavior on the day of adjournment.

The subject-matter of A. L. C. A. conferences—Rural Health, Rural Community Organization, Town and Country Relations, Rural Education, The Rural Home, Rural Religion—indicates that the quest of its members points in the direction of broad social policies. When, for example, a group of persons who do not live in rural homes discuss the rural home generically, they do not assume that specific rural homes will be directly or immediately affected by their

discussion. What they are doing, it seems, amounts to a visualization of the rural home as an institution which they believe could be made to function more effectively. They then proceed to inventory the resources (economic, social, cultural, physical, spiritual resources) which might be enlisted on its behalf. These resources, functionally considered, may be released by forms of social action which involve (a) farmers themselves (farm families), (b) agencies, institutions and organizations equipped to dispense services, and (c) the complex social milieu of which the farm family is an interdependent part. Actual integration, that is, integration in conduct, takes place when such releases are being made consciously and cooperatively. No one is naïve enough to suppose that the intellectual and emotional integrations made in a small conference represent the reality: these are but foreshadowings of possible and probable avenues of integration. Conference, deliberation, discussion: these are means for lowering the threshold of real integrative activity, intellectual and emotional preliminaries which smooth the pathway for ensuing motor-conduct. If wisely used, these instruments serve to correct the inevitable rationalizations which follow conduct, and thereby save these reasons-after-the-fact from becoming the reservoirs of sanction for mediocre behavior.

What is it then that discussion as a method of conference may be expected to do for an organization such as the A. C. L. A.? If this question can be answered, even in part, it will become possible to determine how and to what extent and in what form discussion-methods may be most fruitfully used. But in order to arrive at satisfactory answers, some attempt must be made to define the nature and purposes of the A. C. L. A. By way of opening this question, let us assume that the A. C. L. A. aims to be scientific but is not an organization of scientists. There are, for example, no scientific qualifications for membership. In the second place, even the scientists members are of that type in which so-called pure and applied science are blended. Plainly speaking, they are scientists who desire an application of their science which will enhance human welfare. They are, let us say, scientific reformers. On the other hand, the bulk of the membership consists of persons who are not engaged in scientific research in any sense but whose chief interests

lie in the direction of teaching, or rather of some form of education. This classification covers also the few farmers who attend the annual conferences since these are for the most part leaders within farm organizations or farm communities who interpret their interests in terms of educational functions. If it is remembered that those whose interests are primarily scientific have succeeded in establishing a rural sociology section of the American Sociological Society, one may fairly say that the category which fits the A. C. L. A. membership best is one which resolves scientific rural sociology with rural education. One might suggest for the moment, "rural social educators," implying that these are persons whose interests are rural, whose purposes are social and whose functions are educative. What, then, can an annual discussion-conference do for a group of this sort?

It may be advisable to begin by asking what discussion cannot do for a group of this sort? This query becomes extremely pertinent to the present argument, for I became convinced through observations of the Richmond conference that much of the dissatisfaction (much of which existed as a sort of half-conscious rebellion) rested upon a confusion regarding aims, objectives and purposes.

A discussion conference cannot (a) bring new facts into existence; this is a function of scientific method, and discussion is neither a substitute nor a short-cut for science; (b) adequately scrutinize, test or verify all facts relevant to the problem under consideration; this is also a part of the scientist's function and must be conducted in an atmosphere free from hurry and separated from proposed solutions; (c) wholly eliminate the influence of authoritative personalities; discussion, if it is not itself to become a new mode of authority, must take into account the subjective as well as the objective phases of experience, opinions as well as facts, and desires as well as needs; (d) produce sharply-defined executive conclusions upon which all members may subsequently act. These and other results which are scientifically or executively derived, should not be expected of discussion as applied to an organization such as the A. C. L. A.

Discussion is capable of performing such functions as:

a. Measuring fact against fact.
b. Bring opposing attitudes and beliefs into comparison.
c. Humanize experts by exposing them to social realities.

d. Bring science and experience into relation.
e. Minimize prejudice and place a premium on intelligence.
f. Evaluate and test programs.
g. Reveal conflicting drives and motives.
h. Dissipate merely temperamental differences.
i. Lead to discrimination between facts, opinions and prejudices.
j. Direct research toward needed knowledge.
k. Suggest avenues of fresh experimentation.
l. Re-evaluate aims, purposes, objectives.
m. Create new unities.
n. Initiate new integrations on intellectual and emotional levels.

The A. C. L. A. will know whether or not it desires results such as these which may legitimately be expected of discussion as a conference method. Choice will then depend upon the relative contributing capacity of discussion as measured in comparison with the older methods of addresses, papers, reports.

# THE STUDENT SECTION

Mrs. W. J. Kitchin

National Board of the Y. W. C. A.

Those few students present early Friday morning met for a preliminary session to discover the points about which interest was centered in order that the succeeding sessions might be of real value. The following were topics which seemed to be uppermost:

(1) The method of approach to rural community problems.
(2) Characteristics of the type of rural leadership needed.
    (a) Is this leadership different from that needed in other activities?
(3) Are our colleges training for this rural leadership?
(4) How can we secure united upward lift in our rural institutions?

Because we wanted to know what had been happening in the main section of the A. C. L. A. meeting, our section, as a whole, went into session with the main group. At 5 o'clock Friday evening we assembled for our first separate session, at which President Butterfield spoke. Professor A. Z. Mann, of Hamline College, St. Paul, reported what had already been done toward working out a group of survey questions, which would have the skeleton of the students' summer work and their report of it to a central group—all of these reports to be as a basis for study by students in rural communities during vacation with the hope that from it will come information valuable to many other students.

In order to break into the whole problem of leadership, using the discussion method, the first question was that of the types of activity needing leadership in rural communities.

These range from athletic coaches through vocational features, including all types of activities found in rural communities. What

kind of person ought this leader to be if these are his activities? Dean C. C. Taylor made evident to us that some of the characteristics we had listed were constant—the same for any job; others were variable—varying with the specific job.

Listed under the headings of constants and variables are:

CONSTANTS:

Tactfulness
Willingness
Power to think
Originality—full of ideas, creativity
Lack of bias—qualifying
Adaptability—appreciative of ideas of others
Courage
Work with others—at service of community
Work in the spirit of companionship
Stick-to-it-iveness—endurance
Meeting persons on their own level
Specific training for job
Ability to get contacts with those with whom you work
Knowing people
Letting others work, too
Analytical mind
Christlikeness.

VARIABLES:

Athletic ability
Inclusive knowledge (background).
Mixer
Persuasiveness—convince people of the worth of your jobs or yourselves

In other words, all of these may be summed up as follows:

The constants are: (1) Personality—pep (wanting to get there); (2) Sympathy; (3) Objectivity.

The variables are: Know your job. Knowing how to get there. The subject matter. Aims and objectives. Technique.

How do we get to be this kind of person? Are our colleges train-

ing us to be and to do? Using these last two as our "springboard" for the morning session, the meeting adjourned.

The interest seemed to have crystallized overnight into: "What are the motives for wanting to be a leader and do we have a right to want to be a leader?" Running through the whole morning discussion, there was a deep spirit of inquiry into the source of inspiration, power and motives for doing any job in the rural field.

We said our reasons were: (1) People need help. (a) The job needs to be done. My response to it. (b) My ability to meet the job—to do the thing I can. (2) Social approval—doing the job acceptable to others and being an acceptable person. (3) Natural love of those who benefit through your work. Identification of yourself with group. Sympathy for others. (4) Mutual exchange. (5) A call to service. He who would lead must be the servant of all. (6) Self-expression. Self-satisfaction. Self-approval. Satisfaction of seeing results of our work.

Mr. Kennedy summed it up by using the phrase, "habits, qualities and actions of the leader," and adding that he must test all of it with the laboratory method. He must be able to make plans and work slowly to carry them out.

The discussion on leadership was held up here because we had come not to the end but to the heart of the whole matter: What are the motives for service and how can we explain that miracle of change from wanting to be a safeblower to an unselfish service for a group of people? In front of that miracle, we stop, realizing that it is a matter of spirit, which is partly a matter of environment and partly a matter of growth.

The influences that have made us want to be the kind of person fitted to serve a rural community as companions are: (1) Personalities we have come in contact with. (2) The homes we came from. (3) Contacts with actual people in the situation we want to help. (4) The knowledge of the problems gained through classes or books.

Leaving the matter of leadership with the feeling that each of us would struggle to be more nearly the person needed, we came back to the question planned the night before on "What are our colleges doing to help or to hinder?" The matter of the educational system, with its good or bad results, looked too large and it seemed we could

do so little about changing whatever evils we saw that the discussion swung over into the relationship of extra-curricular activities to the formal curricula of the college in the hope that we might see some ways of adding elements we saw necessary.

How we might help to change the effect of the curricula. (1) Electives intelligently chosen. (2) Students' experiments in extra-curricular activities. (3) Faculty committees on curricula, including alumni and students.

The problems in the class-room situation we drew out and left answered in the following questions: (1) Do students know what they want? (2) Where do they find out what they want? (3) Does the high school help? (4) Is the material in the courses applicable to the student need? (5) Is the method of presentation effective? There seemed to be unanimity in the group that learning includes information, assimilation of that information and the use of it in experience, and a realization that most classes do not offer this latter vital element and that, therefore, we had a multiplicity of extra-curricular activities through which the student tries to meet needs he feels in himself.

We need to know the technique of some of these extra-curricular activities which directly play into the hands of rural problems. Under the leadership of Prof. C. E. Myers, of Penn State, we reviewed the activities of various organizations, mainly those of the collegiate country life clubs.

Kalamazoo reported study classes on economic and other problems, social evenings, speakers and lecturers from the faculty on pertinent problems.

Springfield Y. M. C. A. College reported that the activities of their club were very closely allied with the administration of the college work through a general secretary, who has charge of the extensive field work program, which covers coöperation with the county Y. M. C. A., rural Sunday schools and deputation teams. Springfield also indicated that they require one semester of practical work and six months at an agricultural college before graduation.

Syracuse University, with only 70 students in their agricultural college, reported a country club room in which the life of their group centers with much the same program of speakers and social times,

and the use of the Grange as a model training place for future leaders.

Henry Israel talked on "Unifying the Church, Home and School," and Anna M. Clark closed the conference with a talk about the good life in the rural community.

# PART II

# ADDRESSES AND PAPERS

# PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

## NEEDED READJUSTMENTS IN RURAL LIFE TODAY

KENYON L. BUTTERFIELD

President, American Country Life Association

The rural world of America has fully shared the swift changes that have occurred in our country since the opening of the twentieth century. The shift of population from country to city has gone on unabated. Industrialization has spread the country over and has profoundly affected the farm labor supply and farm labor standards. Suburban growth is amazing and has had immense influence upon land values near hundreds of cities. The urban scale of living, higher than ever before in this country or in history, has reached farm life and has transformed its standards and ideals of living, recreation, fashion. The most potent change of all is in rapid transportation and quick communication which are largely responsible for the other changes. A rural revolution has been effected in twenty years.

This changed and changing rural world brings with it a host of problems, economic, political, social. The theme for this convention opens the floodgates of possible discussion of almost every aspect of the many-sided rural problem, with its pressing questions. For example, in the economic field, it is now obvious that agriculture has become thoroughly commercial and is no longer self-sufficing. It is a business of manufacturing under conditions that do not prevail in any other industry. Yet the question comes, whether there should not be a return to a mixed method by which at least the small farms produce a much larger supply of the food for the farm family. Price relationships are not satisfying to farmers even yet, due to the contrast between prices for supplies and prices for products. Probably we have over-stressed bad times as we over-stress good times. Agriculture is a long-term industry.

We are working away at the problem of distribution. And questions of quality of products, of standards, of grades and packings, of selling skill, and of regional competition between commodities are all vital questions in the marketing problem. "Orderly marketing" is a real issue. There is incessant discussion of the possibility of controlled production, of "cost plus." Here we face not only the exigencies of the weather as affecting production and cost, but centuries of individualistic thinking on the part of farmers, and the difficulty of securing the correlated efforts of six million farm managers scattered over the entire country. We cannot long put off organized efforts to zone agricultural production, relying upon the steam road for the long haul only and upon trucks for the short haul to the neighboring city.

High land values and speculative values increase the difficulty of obtaining capital for the individual farmer. Industry and the new immigration law have played havoc with farm labor and have taken to town not only the laborer but the sons of the farmer and even the farmer himself. Farm management becomes a much more complicated business than ever before, in the face of those pressing economic questions. The concentration of wealth in cities and the development of huge incomes have made obsolete the old property tax, in so far as justice to the farmer is concerned. The farmer, for the first time in American history, is seriously demanding a tariff on his products or its equivalent.

And this fact brings us face to face with the food problem. The food demand, the changing dietary, problems of consumption as well as of distribution, world competition, extreme nationalism especially on an economic basis, the evidence of the desire of many nations to become completely self-sufficing as to food; and, on the other hand, the increasing difficulty of maintaining commercial walls of any sort between countries in this socially-knit world are bringing us to a new recognition of the needs of the farmer as the food supplier of the industrial and urban classes.

We have new political questions. Economic and social problems are more and more dominating political affairs. The efficiency of government is not unimportant, and county government certainly needs to be studied and probably reformed. But the rise of the

farm bloc is merely a symptom of the extent to which the economic problems that have been mentioned are sure to play a part, and an increasingly large part, in state and federal legislation. The extent to which the group system in politics, that is, the farm bloc, or even farmers' parties, continue or develop, depends upon the degree with which the farmers are satisfied with the legislation that they secure.

We are gradually becoming conscious also of the rural social problem, and this is the special interest of this Association and of this conference. At the outset, we have to consider the effect of these various economic and political problems upon the welfare of the rural people, upon their life and their institutions. Conversely, what can various social agencies do to assist in the adequate readjustment of economic and political considerations?

This brings us at once to the question as to just how economic and social problems are interrelated, a relationship that has not yet been worked out. It needs scientific approach as well as popular discussion. The tenant problem will not down. It is not necessary to condemn it in order to indicate that it involves many economic and social questions of high importance. Then there is rural social work in the technical sense—a sadly neglected field. I am sure that the American Country Life Association represents a great movement and that the idea of country life improvement, of human welfare, of pooling the efforts of all rural-minded folk on behalf of a better rural life and a better rural community is growing. The international aspects of the country life movement are emerging as is evident by repeated reports from the Assembly of the Institute of Agriculture in Rome.

Here, then, is a brief analysis of the situation, that emphasizes the fact of a changing rural world. The necessity for readjustment is obvious but to what end? What are the objectives? The answers to this query open a field of discussion that ought to be gone into with great care, but at present one must be somewhat dogmatic. The underlying issue is the development and maintenance of an adequate rural civilization in all that those terms imply. And there are certain fairly good tests of an adequate civilization. One test is the status of woman, and of all matters relating to the home and home life of farm people. In general, how can we maintain the

quality of rural people, intellectually, morally, and spiritually, as well as people industrially effective? Material standards of living are sure to play a large part in a satisfying rural life. Beyond that are the standards of life, in the spiritual sense, that enter into the question of quality of people. And finally, there is the desire to maintain adequate social institutions—school and church and machinery for health and recreation, economic groupings, and so on. These institutions must not only be accessible to the people but they must be of real vital value to the people and must be managed locally and not from outside. Many of our rural communities are pitifully poor in all organized endeavor of any real consequence. Another way of stating this larger objective is that we must build a permanent agriculture. This question is usually approached perhaps from the technical or economic sides, and has to do, first of all, with maintaining soil fertility. But all the questions that have been mentioned enter into it, for after all a permanent agriculture means a high quality of people. This way of putting the matter leads at once to the inquiry, is a peasantry necessary to permanent agriculture? We have in America a fluid agriculture and we do not have a peasantry. Is the tendency the other way and must we pay the price of a peasant régime in order to have a permanent and efficient agriculture?

I believe that if we are to attain or even approach our great objectives, there are certain attitudes of mind that must be developed and that must pervade our organized rural endeavor. First of all, farm life must attract. We must have a satisfying country life. There must be an attitude of enthusiasm toward farming and the farm mode of life. People must like it and must prefer the country. They must like nature and the out-of-doors. They must have somewhat the passion of the artist for this way of living. We can't expect this result, however, unless there are elements in farm life that do satisfy a reasonably normal human interest.

There must be the desire for a Christian social order. The farmers themselves must believe in a Christian civilization both rural and urban. They must themselves be interested not merely in class advantages or even in class justice, but in such far-sweeping matters as the democratization of industry, the amelioration of race antipa-

thies, international coöperation, the abolition of war. They are citizens of a common country, they are citizens of the world, and they must play their part adequately in it. Now the crux of this whole matter is that we shall eliminate the non-Christian elements in our social order and seek to make it thoroughly Christian so far as it is humanly possible.

These attitudes involve readjustment in the urban mind as well as in the rural mind. They convince us that we should have not rural *versus* urban but rural *and* urban relationships. The attitudes of the city people towards farming are a big factor in the attitude of farming people toward farming. And the attitude of city people toward farmers has a big part to play in the coöperation which farmers give to the solution of these common fundamental problems.

Finally, we are interested in the practical questions of methods. I believe the great principle here is the establishment of certain unities.

First of all, the unit of economic endeavor I believe must be the commodity. In distribution this is evident. But let us go farther than that. We must approach the wheat problem, the potato problem, and the milk problem as a unit all the way from the selection of soil and of seed or animal to the best use on the consumer's table. Then we need programs of progress by geographical areas. This involves, of course, studying needs and mapping policies, making plans. A national agricultural program will probably be a matter of slow development which will come out of many factors but we are approaching this very thing.

Many states have already established state programs, at least on paper, and are making every effort to carry them out. The whole business of building or rebuilding the agriculture of the state is brought into unity, not only with itself, but is made a part of a larger unity. That is, the goal is the adequate development of the whole state itself in industry and commerce as well as in agriculture, and with its social aspects as well as with its economical and political aspects. The county, of course, has come to be a very important unit although, in a sense, an artificial one. In practice, we rely on county lines to a very large extent. The degree to which counties

can support rural agencies and how they can be correlated in each county are some of our most pressing practical questions.

There is the matter of community organization, the most important and vital of all. Here we have to deal with the correlation of the farmstead and the village. The church must face a probable reorganization of its parish lines. The whole notion of making the community a unit, and getting all the people and organizations of the community to work together for the common good of the community, is the largest and the most comprehensive and the most vital idea in our whole program of rural progress.

Another unity consists in significant drives and campaigns for such problems as the betterment of rural schools, the suppression of child labor, the development of continuing education for all ages and all people, the push for a strong country church, the development of international country life,—ends like these are bound to be more and more recognized as important unities.

Two problems in closing. One is the problem of research. We must apply the scientific method to all of these questions, economic, political, and social. We must have facts. We must, from these facts, elucidate principles and we must do this in such a way as to appeal to the common mind. The other problem is the training of leadership, both professional and voluntary, in our schools and colleges for participation in the solution of these many difficult questions in this changing rural world by means of intelligent application of the results of research, and the spirit of sympathy and insight into the needs and the mind of our rural folk.

# PUBLIC WELFARE AND DEMOCRACY*

HOWARD W. ODUM

Professor of Sociology, University of North Carolina

My quest on this occasion, if stated in general terms, would be to find the place which public welfare holds in the rediscovery, development, and adjustment of the people now necessary for any adequate functioning of effective democracy. There are in this quest so many long roads, with so much variableness and shadow of turning, that we shall need to confine ourselves to two or three general main by-ways and to the interpretation of one or two concrete patterns and vehicles for further progress and experimentation. These by-ways lead up to the problems of the discovery of the people; to bridging the distance between the people, on the one hand, and government and social direction on the other; and to such technique for developing and adjusting the common man as may be essential to making democracy effective in the unequal places. The concrete patterns presented may be illustrated by the state systems of public welfare prevalent in this country and particularly the Virginia and North Carolina plans.

We approach the problem of rediscovering the people from three directions. One is from the viewpoint of the people themselves. Here, like hosts of college youths, with new knowledge and new experience, suffering in the midst of intellectual and spiritual conflicts, the great body of folk come to the college age and suffer no less, cause no less misgivings, and pave the way for no less important growth and development. What this self-discovery through knowledge and contacts will mean must depend, as with vigorous youth come to maturity, upon the sort of understanding and social

*Abstract of talk before the joint meeting of the American Country Life Association and the Virginia Conference of Social Work. Richmond, Virginia, October 27, 1925.

direction which society can give. We approach again from the viewpoint of the social technician—the man in government, in education, in social work, in the other professions and in the marts of more cosmopolitan experience. Here are whole hosts of the learned who have just begun to know something of the realism through which democracy presents facts and folks as they are. Neither learned idealist or theorist, nor popular dreamer or optimist need any longer be screened from the view of the people or misled into evolving impossible and unattainable details of popular participation in government and public welfare. We approach again from a third and most important direction. It is from the viewpoint of the social sciences, of social engineering, of public welfare. We have just begun to realize that we have never paid much attention to the discovery and measurement of the social potential of the masses, or of social values based upon adequate selection and combination of human resources. Localized and mechanical tests of experience and intelligence yielding social programs, rarely dealing with people, but with unreality born of pen and paper, might easily miss social progress by a millennium and make efforts for social adjustment only a cycle of deterioration and chaos. Here is the promise of tomorrow's pioneering in public welfare and social development.

Undoubtedly one of the most difficult and important tasks of the modern era is that of bridging the distance between people and social technician. Such distance is far greater than is ordinarily understood by the average man who works in halls of learning or in professional public service. So great is the distance that we come to the remarkable spectacle, both tragic and comic, of finding our great educational and cultural institutions, in the eyes of many folk harangued by demagogues, literally lined up in battle array against the interests of the people whom they are charged to serve. Such distance is not due to difference in intelligence, for many of the common folk have more intelligence than most of the learned. It is due to many causes, none of which change the importance of the situation. Difference in experience, difference in education, the power of tradition over progress, the blighting influence of the political and the ecclesiastical demagogue, the limitations of social technique, the natural rise of specialisms—these and other influences,

alongside the multiplication of knowledge and tools, make distances so great that physical metaphors of distance from mountain crag to shores of sand seem pathetically futile. It thus happens that we face the paradox of having our prevailing terminology and technique of government, of business, of social organization, of civilization cast far beyond the present understanding of the people who at the same time are charged with greater active participation in these specialisms and judged as wanting because they do not understand, with little opportunity to learn, what it has taxed all our best specialists to evolve and to put into limited practice. This task of bridging distance is inseparably linked up with the other tasks of rediscovering the people and of new social adjustments needed.

The constantly recurring problem of adjusting government and social direction to the people whose life, beliefs and customs change much more slowly than social and economic conditions is always an important task. I suppose it is generally conceded to be critical at this time. From the viewpoint of social work and public welfare we approach this problem from several directions. First, there is the effort constantly to be on the lookout for the lost individual who needs to be found and adjusted to his environment in such way as to give him his equal opportunity to do his best. This we call social case work. There are, then, groups or classes who are so far lost as to need readjustment to the community and to the social institutions. Thus we proceed with settlement programs, with recreation and play, with social service programs throughout the community. And then there are the organizations and even whole communities lost in the process of social and economic development, so that the problems of coöperation, of correlation of efforts, of finding the best way for united work lead to the larger technique of community organization. There is, again, the problem of the lost social institution—the family, the church, the industrial epoch, the tasks of government against revolution, and the others. We face no more important problem than that of finding the institution, and of helping it to find itself and become stronger as a buffer between the individual and social change. Institutions are more lost than broken. Here, then, is the super problem of social reform or direction. And there is, finally, the problem of finding and adjusting

the lost truth to its place and purpose, than which there is no more imminent task now before us. If ever there was a time when truth seems lost and in need of discovery and utilization it is now. Thus social research comes to assume new responsibilities in its effort toward social study and interpretation, and adaptation.

This fivefold approach to social adaptation is, of course, following the outlines of advanced social work. I take it that public welfare may be interpreted now as the social work part of government. I take it that we may even refer to it as a sixth approach to adaptation, as the lost part of government in its larger services toward the development and government of the people. It is, therefore, a sort of final step in democracy, essential to the coördination and effectiveness of all the other aspects. It may be defined as that very definite technique and organization of government which guarantees that democracy will be made effective in the unequal places—effective in actual deed and practice, even as in ideals, laws and statutes. Public welfare may be illustrated in terms of an analogy by saying that it is to the society of a modern, complex industrial and urban civilization what the constitution was to our early and simple organization—namely, something to give definite form and technique to our ideals. Again, it may be illustrated as being to human adequacy what the economy and efficiency movement has been to government—the elimination of waste and realization of larger returns. Thus public welfare ought to become to this half century what public education was to the first half of the last century. Through the public welfare program each community may underwrite, as it were, its task of guaranteeing that within its own domain the guarantees of equal opportunity may become a reality, and the distance between people and government kept constantly and strongly bridged. Through its programs of prevention and cure, of study and work, public welfare seeks to bring to pass a state of effective democracy not yet achieved in the history of governments.

But public welfare not only appeals to the good sense and imagination of modern folk through its embodiment of the principles of democracy and the essence of Christianity but also because of its importance in the whole program of economy and efficiency in government. Any aspect of government which involves one-fifth of the

total public expenditures has the right to the best effort and the most careful consideration of the governing and the governed. From states like North Carolina and Virginia, with relatively small appropriations, to states like Pennsylvania, with annual expenditures of twenty-five million dollars, the ratio is uniformly important.

When we come to look, therefore, for a definite pattern or vehicle of public welfare which will best meet the needs of the hour and the rural areas we seem to have made some progress. The establishment of state boards and state departments of public welfare has been most important. More than two-thirds of the states have taken some steps in the right direction and I know of no state which is not vitally concerned about strengthening its present efforts and enlarging its results for more effective service. And the state department which seems most effective is that which provides for county and community units and insuring harmony with other state departments, high standards of ultimate work, adequate local initiative. The important prerequisites therefore would be: A state administrative machinery, a county unit, a program of scientific social work, provision for the coöperation of private agencies and civic effort, and coöperation with other state departments. Such systems as Virginia, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Missouri, are typical of plans to study. There are many difficulties and obstacles in the way, but no more than have existed in other items of social progress. Not only the general ignorance of people high and low as to the importance of welfare but indifference on the part of the people everywhere constitute the chief obstacles. There are, then, many wrong concepts of public welfare, confusing this governmental activity with charity. There are many wrong and unscientific assumptions and lack of faith in democracy as it shall be developed. And there is the very difficult situation involved in demagogic leadership. On the one hand there is the politician who appeals to wrong motives and customs and there is the ecclesiastical demagogue who appeals to bigotry and the high faith of the people. There are, of course, the very marked limitations of our own social technique and the inability of leaders to get close to their problems, to understand the people, to agree among themselves, and to proceed

with practical programs which conform to sound principles of government, economics, the social order.

It is an encouraging illustration of the present tendency to find a state conference of social work joining with a group working for a greater rural life and civilization to promote the cause of public welfare and to stand on record as believing in and developing the Virginia plan of public welfare. It is an encouraging sign to find state conferences of social work everywhere eagerly working on plans to find the happy combination of private and public social work, so that the technique of public welfare may be added to the other effective techniques of government and democracy.

# THE FARMER'S ADJUSTMENTS TO THE COMMERCIAL WORLD

CARL C. TAYLOR

Dean of the Graduate School, North Carolina College of Agriculture

The two most universal sets of adjustments which every person engaged in the profession of agriculture today must make are those to the physical elements such as the soil, climate and the nurture of crops and animals and those to the markets in which the products of the farm are sold. The modern farmer must be both a scientist and a business man if he is going to be a suceessful *entrepreneur*.

Every known method and accomplishment of exact and practical farm science is today laid at his feet in helping him to make his adjustments to the physical elements just mentioned and in teaching him the latest facts and practices in the nurture of plants and animals. A corps of literally thousands of well-trained specialists serve him as agents and assistants in these tasks. But in his adjustments to the stern and complex facts and conditions of the commèrcial world, into which he has been thrown heels first in the last half century, he is largely left to flounder.

What is this commercial world? What sort of adjustments must he make to it? What must he know and what must he do to catch step with it? It is a world of prices and markets, an economic régime in which dividends on all divisions of society's labor are declared. It is modern civilization. The adjustments he must make to it are those which have to do with costs of production, bargaining power in the markets of the world and dividends to be awarded for economic accomplishment. What he must know is how market prices are made and the thing he must do is to put himself in a position, both intellectually and physically, to help make them. Failing to do this he will fail in everything else which goes to make him a successful farmer.

But why are these *needed* adjustments; i.e., why are they things that demand change? Why haven't they long since been made if the farmer has been in this régime for fifty years? Haven't they been made? Well, the farmer doesn't think so, even though the *laissez faire* economist thinks that they have been or will be without conscious effort and though the thousands of farm expert leaders may assume the same thing. The farmer and his family are living on a lower standard of living than his brother *entrepreneur* in many other walks of life. He wants more dividends with which to fill in the gap which has widened in the last century. He knows that all dividends are declared in the market place and he therefore seeks to make adjustments to the commercial world, of which the market is the heart and core. The reasons he hasn't accomplished apt adjustments in the price and market régime, although he has been in it for two generations and in some sections of the country for seven generations, are because he is more a creature of custom and his occupation is more largely one of apprenticeship than that of any other *entrepreneur;* because he has been considered as only a tiller of the soil and above all because his trained leaders have become confused in processes of production technique to the end that he has been taught much more successfully to accomplish his task of feeding the world than to care well for his own family and community and to build an adequate civilization in the rural sections of our nation.

If we were still living in the day when the farm family got practically its whole standard of living out of its own herds and fields and flocks, then the task of adjustments would be complete when the farmer had learned to make two blades of grass grow where one previously grew. That day was a part of the early life of men yet living but it is now universally past for them and all other farmers. The farmer of today purchases his standard of living from the ends of the earth. What he purchases and, therefore, largely what he has depend upon the dividends he collects in the markets in which he sells his raw products. He not only demands and has a right to the hundreds of things which have but recently become a part of our general middle class standards of living—pianos, Fords and radios—but he must purchase clothes, implements, furniture, flour, and a

hundred other things which were at one time made on the farm but which now, in the economy of specialization and division of labor, have slipped away to the city.

Let us not imagine that the American farmer has not recognized his changed status or seen that this adjustment needed to be made. Immediately following the Civil War he made his protest and attempted to work out the adjustment to the commercial régime which was just then coming into America at full tide. The Granger Movement of the early seventies which swept into its ranks over seven hundred thousand individuals, setting up all kinds of business enterprises and even organizing a half dozen new political parties, was an attempt at adjustment. The Agricultural Wheel, the Louisiana Farmers Union and the two Farmers' Alliances of the eighties and early nineties were continuations of the same attempt. This consolidated movement mobilized upwards of four million people who sought by economic and political organizations to accomplish the needed adjustments. These giant "ground swells" among the farmers of the nation have been looked upon as both foolish and futile. And indeed so they were to a great degree. But so is the struggle to live often foolish or at least futile if no physician is at hand. They were concerted, though to some degree unconscious, attempts on the part of the farmers to become an integral part of the commercial régime. They did not end with the death of the Farmers' Alliance and the Populist Episode. The Farmers Union, the Gleaners, the rejuvenated Grange, the American Society of Equity, the Equity Union, and more recently the Farm Bureau and the great commodity coöperatives have kept up the attempt to make this needed adjustment to the price and market régime. As a matter of fact farmers are today almost universally organized in one way or another for economic action. We are rapidly approaching a day when a majority of the American farmers will be members of one or more of these economic organizations. If we were to count individual organization memberships it is probable that we would find that the total roll would now be more than one-half the total number of farm *entrepreneurs* of the nation. These are, all of them, conscious or unconscious, direct or indirect,

attempts to adjust the enterprise of farming to the conditions and practices of the modern world.

A movement—for movement it is—which appears and reappears and in fact never ceases to be present, and which continually attempts to gain its ends by use of the same machinery, must have some real causes and must have a pretty definite "hunch" that it can get action sooner or later by continually experimenting along the line of its "hunch." Shortly stated, the cause is that farmers are not participating equally with other classes in the economic and social dividends of organized society. The "hunch" is that they never will until they are in a position to exercise some control over the machinery which distributes dividends, viz. the market.

The agrarian movement is parallel to the labor movement and to the industrial revolution. The growing class consciousness and multiplied group economic, non-partisan, political activities and bureaucratic organization would seem to be enough to indicate the similarity of the farmer movement to the labor movement. The rapid and drastic transformation which is taking place in farm operations, particularly in the conduct of farm business, suggests a similarity to the industrial revolution. The difference is that it was the advent of power machinery and the mobilization of capital which ushered in the industrial revolution, while it is the application of merchandizing to farm commodities and the mobilization of farm credit which is ushering in the agrarian movement. Wages and hours were the needed adjustments in the industrial revolution. Prices and markets are the needed adjustments in the agrarian revolution.

It is impossible for the modern farmer to withdraw from the price and market régime. He lives and works in a world that is universally organized on these bases. I need not recount the economic and social advantages which he and all others gain because of this fact. Suffice it to say that he is fully into the commercial world and is without either the knowledge or organization with which to cope with its problems. It must be patent then that the way to help him make this needed adjustment is to help him get the economic information and organization with which to operate.

I have no intentions of being vague in this suggestion. What I

mean to say is that it is up to every agency, voluntary or official, which is seeking to help the farmer to be efficient and successful in his task of farming to furnish him information and education in these two fields. It is just as much a part of the task of an agricultural college through its extension, experiment station and teaching organizations to develop and spread knowledge concerning the methods of price making as it is to develop and spread knowledge concerning the making of boll weevil poison, fertilizers or balanced animal food ratios. The same thing is true of federal agencies and agricultural journals.

All of these agencies are beginning to attack commercial problems to some extent. Most of them are proud of the beginning they have made. Would they be if an honest and intelligent appraisal were made of the emphasis which they are giving to some other problems in agriculture? Let us open our eyes right wide open. Do we honestly believe that the farmer on his farm and the farmer's sons at college need from ten to twenty-five times as much instruction in soils, physical production and plant and animal diseases as they do in costs, prices, credits, markets and organization? I for one do not. I believe that the farmer's most dominant and most difficult problems today are the problems which confront him in his commercial relationships. They are more complex than any of his problems of production. They are more difficult to understand and they are far more difficult to influence. A knowledge of them is much less apt to be assimilated or learned though from apprenticeship than any other phase of successful farming. The adjustment must be made by way of economic education. I believe that the issue is so important and so pressing and has been for a generation, that fully one-half the time, money and energy of the agencies of agricultural education and leadership should be given to helping the farmer to make an honest, intelligent and successful adjustment to the world's price and market system.

# THE CANADIAN SITUATION

J. B. Reynolds

President, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Canada

Agriculture and country life have been as profoundly affected by science and invention as any industry or any mode of life. In an industrial and commercial age, the country has become industrialized and commercialized. The farm is no longer self-sustaining and self-sufficient. The farmer is no longer independent as we once proudly boasted. The farm home is no longer the center of a group of productive industries. The farm produces the raw materials of industry, and buys the finished products, or their equivalent in foreign importations. As one of our Scotch-born farmers lamented, he and his generation were raised on oatmeal and the Shorter Catechism. The present generation of children is being raised on cornflakes and the mail-order catalogue. The country has become dependent upon the industries and the commercial houses of large towns and cities often distant. The country town and the rural village, that used to be thriving centers of industry and trade, ministering to the necessities of their rural localities, have become or are rapidly becoming places of residence for retired farmers.

In farm practice continuous adjustments have been made. Machinery has taken the place of hand labor. New crops have continually replaced the old, to meet the demands of a changing soil, and a changing market. When rust struck the spring wheat many years ago in Ontario, barley was substituted, and a profitable market found in the United States. When a troublesome tariff closed that market, the farmers began growing fodder crops—corn and clover and coarse grains—and feeding livestock. Experience showed that certain districts were suited, by soil or climate, to the production of special crops; our counties were then marked off into potato regions, peach and grape regions, apple regions, turnip and tobacco and alfalfa

regions. When the potato beetle and the codling moth and the San José scale and other diseases and pests appeared, science discovered methods of control and the farmers adopted them and went on producing with an extra share or two added to their work.

In social, recreational and intellectual life, there was an early period when our rural people were independent and self-sustaining. They had their singing schools and debating clubs and dramatic societies. This period was followed by one of urban influence, in which country people either went to town for their amusement and recreation, or imported town talent to their local gatherings. The present tendency is indicated by a gathering which took place in the city of Guelph on October 16. Five hundred young people, members of the Junior Farmers' Improvement Association and of the Junior Women's Institutes of the county of Wellington, met for a banquet. Following the banquet, prizes, medals, and certificates were presented for inter-club competitions in solo singing, chorus singing, debating, public speaking, and hockey. Competitions in these events were held last winter and spring. All of the competitors belonged to the farm. This is an example of significant readjustment, which has its roots in a widespread farmers' movement, and which has borne fruit in a new self-reliance, and a new desire for self-expression among the young people of the rural districts.

Science and art are beginning to make their adjustments in the homes and lives of the rural people. A misdirected desire for ornamentation and beauty has planted many a horrible example of city house architecture on the farms of Canada. But science is correcting this bad taste, and is now erecting broad-based houses of simple lines to fit into the rural landscape. Vines and shrubbery, planted too closely, have shrouded many a country house in gloom. The simple laws of hygiene are now placing shrubs and trees at a respectful distance from the house, and letting the air and the sunlight into the windows. We all love fresh, sparkling water, whether rippling over the stones of the creek, or standing deep in the farm well. But our rural people are beginning to be suspicious of wells too near the barnyards, and of the moss-covered bucket. Bacteriology has revealed too clearly the dangers lurking in both.

Rural organizations have passed through various phases in

Canada, economic, social, and political, similar in their history to those in the United States. There have been the Grange, the Patrons of Industry, and now we have the United Farmers. The successive readjustments have been brought about partly by changes in the circumstances and the temper of the people, and partly from decline of the old organizations as a result of the obscuring of issues involved. The United Farmers of the various provinces started as economic organizations, pledged to remove certain ills and disabilities to which agriculture was subject. In that capacity they have accomplished much, especially in coöperative organizations for buying and selling, and in bringing the weight of an organized economic class to resist the aggressions of consolidated financial and commercial interests. Though these purposes have been obscured and in part defeated by political ventures, yet the gains secured by the organizations of United Farmers, or by whatever name they have been known in the different provinces, are real and substantial and, it is to be hoped, will prove permanent. These organizations have aimed to educate their members on matters of public policy, and to consolidate their sentiments and opinions into a form described as class consciousness. In coöperative marketing, the farmers' associations have achieved the most noted successes in organizing to sell on a single commodity basis. Honey, wool, turnips, apples, potatoes, have been sold coöperatively to advantage by associations handling single commodities. Perhaps the most conspicuous success in this direction has been achieved by the wheat-growers of Western Canada.

In its associations of Women's Institutes which originated twenty years ago, Canada has perhaps a unique organization. There are local associations, which elect delegates to county, provincial and national conventions. The motto of the Institutes is "For Home and Country," and its interests include the school, rural hygiene, house planning and home beautification, social and recreational activities. For the promotion of a wholesome rural life there is no more effective force in Canada than the Women's Institutes.

These various adjustments that I have described, being for the most part spontaneous, springing out of the circumstances and the needs of the people, originating in their own volition and carried on

by their own energies, are necessary adjustments. So long as the character and circumstances of the people do not undergo a sudden revolution, past adjustments indicate what future adjustments probably will be. Outside forces, whether governmental, sociological or philanthropic, may help or fail to help, but the best kind of help from any source is that which enables country people to help themselves, to make their own adjustments, to live lives that satisfy the intellect and the social sense, as well as the purse.

The great readjustment needed at the present time is the fundamental one of values—not property values, but life values. What modes of living, what manners of occupation are worth while? We shall never be able on either side of the boundary line to make progressive readjustments in rural life unless the people in town, as well as in the country, accept and proclaim a more exalted sense of rural values than prevails today.

# THE FAMILY AND PRIVATE OWNERSHIP

E. V. O'Hara

Director, Rural Life Bureau, National Catholic Welfare Conference

It seems to me that it may be important for us in working on our rural life programs to relate them to principles, at least occasionally, because we know of people who are on their way but don't know where they are going, and it won't do for people in such a fundamental industry as farming to be in that position. So permit me to recall the two fundamental things which it seems to me can unite all workers in the rural field.

These two important things are, first, a recognition of the primacy of the family among social institutions, and, second, the recognition of the fundamental importance of the wide diffusion of the private ownership of productive property. I take it that these are two of the great underlying social principles of all time, neither of which can be neglected without the gravest social consequences, and their particular relation to the agricultural profession is one of the most interesting in the whole range of social study.

The fact that the farm is the native habitat of the family is a truth of such basic significance that I think it cannot be estimated. We shall be told again and again that it is only on the farm that economic forces work for the unity of the family; that there father and mother and children are engaged in the same occupation, are making the same social contacts and are having the same intellectual interests, with the result that the family is held together by the economic forces through which it operates; whereas in the city the husband is engaged in an occupation perhaps entirely unknown to his wife and children, the children are drawn from the home in recreation and education, with the result that a home is blown

apart and the cancer of divorce is eating its way into our urban civilization, an evil which is almost unknown, or at least comparatively unknown, in the rural communities. The very fundamental principle of family life is unity. The unity and indissolubility of the marriage tie are basic in any philosophy that will look to wholesome family life, and the farm alone provides an occupation in which economic forces work for the unity and strength of the family tie instead of working for its destruction and elimination. It is only on the farm that the child has apprenticeship in a great profession in America working under his parents; learning with the experience of a thousand generations has taught the farmer the control of natural forces.

Again, it is in the country alone that the child is an asset economically, whereas in the city he is economically a liability. I had this brought home to me very vividly the other day when I revisited my home in Minnesota where my brother and his family live. I was walking down through the field and I saw two children on horseback bringing home forty cows. One was my nephew, nine years old, and the other was my niece, seven years old, and the seven-year-old was galloping across the pasture riding her pony bareback, bringing home the cattle—an economic service which was a great joy to her and a great service to the household. It simply illustrates that the youngest children on the farm can be of value. And of course the consequence of all these things put together and of any other thing of a similar character, is the truth which Dr. Galpin has been expounding for us, and others with him, that the country is the source of population, that is where the children are; and consequently, just as a city which received its water supply from a far mountain would be unstatesmanlike if it were to permit the source of its water supply to become polluted or the mountain to become denuded of timber and thus diminish the supply, so the cities of the nation will be unstatesmanlike if they permit the sources of population to be polluted, if they permit the country child to grow up without culture, without morals, without religion, without strength and character.

That, it seems to me, is the first basic principle on which we are operating—that the family has a primacy among the institutions

of society, and that the farm is the native habitat of the family. And the second principle I have named—the tremendous importance to society and to the family of the widest possible diffusion of private ownership of productive property. Christianity has always recognized this and it has set its face against anything that would minimize the widest diffusion of productive property. You remember that Pliny, drawing a picture of what happened to ancient Rome, said: "The amassing of great estates destroyed Italy." And the same story could be recorded of many a modern state and certainly can be recorded of any society that permits it. It is in the wide diffusion of private ownership of productive property that you have the security of our American institutions. The families that own the farms of America, with their many billions of dollars of wealth, present the widest diffusion of the private ownership of productive property in America. All other ownership of productive property is not quite insignificant but comparatively insignificant as compared with that diffusion. And as a great statesman, Pope Leo XIII, whose encyclical on the condition of labor was fundamental in establishing the modern view of the labor problem, said in that letter, the families will not be economically independent unless the father of the family owns lucrative property. Those who depend upon wages are not economically independent. If their wage ceases they are in a position of having to accept, as far as the great body of laborers is concerned, what will be offered to them. Only those who own privately lucrative property have true economic independence. They are the only people who can stand on their own feet, and they derive from economic independence all the other practical social independences, and so it is of the greatest importance for family life and for social life at large that there be the widest diffusion in the ownership of productive property. The farms of America give that opportunity and so we should work for the greatest possible access to the land and to ownership of the land by the operators of it.

These two things seem to me to be fundamental, things that run through and give meaning to all our efforts for the rural population, and it is on these things that we can all work, feeling that we have here things that give significance to the slightest work, whether in the economic field or the social or the cultural or the religious field.

Whatever we do to promote these things, we are promoting the well-being of the individuals whom we are assisting, we are promoting the well-being of family life, which is the well-spring of all social life, and we are promoting the wider diffusion of the ownership of productive property among the great body of our citizens and providing thereby the stability of our whole country.

# ECONOMIC EFFECTS OF BELIEF IN TRANSMIGRATION

SAM HIGGINBOTTOM

Ewing Christian College, Allahabad, India

The cow is the most sacred of all of India's gods. Traveling through India at the railways stations you will see a very courtly old gentleman with a collecting box. You can read the printing on the box and know that this gentleman is authorized to collect money for the homes for aged, indigent, decrepit cows, and all the public spirit that is displayed by medical and public men in endowing universities and schools and hospitals—all that wealth—is expended in India by the orthodox Hindu in financing these homes.

I think that a townsman of mine is without doubt the third leading Hindu of England. He was made an unofficial member of a committee to study the cattle problem of India. There were on this committee British officials and Indian officials; there were British commercial men, merchants and millionaires, as well as these Hindu non-officials. As the committee met in Delhi one of these Englishmen, a business man, said, "I can't see why the government is so foolish as to waste its money and our time in calling us together to discuss the cattle problem in India. We all know what it is. There are far too many cattle for the good of the country. They outrun the food supply and the remedy is to slaughter these cattle in ports like Bombay, Madras and Calcutta and then put them in refrigerating ships. Europe is a market that can absorb any amount of cold storage beef." My fellow townsman got up and said, "Sir, I cannot stay in a room and hear such remarks made, such sentiments expressed. I would just as soon discuss the murder of my mother as discuss the murder of a cow."

He represents the ordinary Indian attitude. Any of you who

have been brought up in a religious atmosphere, in a religious home —every term of adoration and worship that you have ever used, the Hindu applies to the cow. You get that in the September *Atlantic Monthly* in a little story written by Miss Fuller, who for a good many years was in India. She was a graduate of Oberlin and a life-long friend of my wife's, and she happened to be maid of honor at our wedding in Bombay. She has written with all the certainty that Kipling has. I don't mean to say that she is a second Kipling, but Miss Fuller has caught his spirit, as she describes the song that the women are singing about the cow.

As a matter of fact there are sixty-five head of domestic cattle to every one hundred acres in India; there are sixty-one domestic cattle to every hundred of the population. Remember that India has the largest goat population in the world—over twenty-five million of them. We have enormous numbers of sheep. Every washerman needs a donkey and so we have millions of donkeys. We have horses and ponies and camels; we have enormous herds of wild deer. There are also enormous herds of wild pigs, all of which depend for their living upon the soil and the competition between man and animals in India, for the production of the soil is terrific. But do not get the mistaken idea which so many people in America have that India is overpopulated. The cultural land of India has a density of population six times as great as the United States. Of the so-called uncultural waste, a great part of the millions of acres of it will be cultural as soon as the schemes now going on in Punjab are completed. There is one little detail which will bring ten and a half million acres under the plow. In Sind there is a smaller project that is being carried on that will bring three and a half million acres under the plow. When that is done, in what is now the Northern India desert we will have five times the present irrigated area of land, and then I believe India will lead the world in the production of cotton and a number of other products. When that water which now runs to the sea through the Indus River is used for irrigating the desert we will have productive soil there.

India is not overpopulated but there is an intense competition between men and animals. India has entirely too many animals and the reason for that is the religious beliefs of the people. They

believe in the transmigration theory; that is, when I die my spirit goes into some other being. If I have been very good, if I am a low caste man, I may rise; if I have been bad, I may become a washerman's donkey; if I have been unbelievably bad, I may come back as a woman, which of course is a terrible thing in India.

India is the poorest country on the face of God's earth. No matter where you study, no matter where you get your figures, no matter whether they are pro or anti, there is a remarkable unanimity regarding the poverty of India. It is instanced by the fact that two out of every three babies born in the City of Bombay die within the first year. Up our way it isn't so bad; only about forty or fifty per cent of the babies born die within the first year. Lucia Fuller again tells of the peculiar pallor of the little baby that lies most of the time in an opium stupor. While opium is a fine thing to keep a baby quiet if the mother can't nurse the baby or can't buy milk or food for it, it isn't a very good thing for the baby, and not a little of the lack of physical vigor of India is due to the fact that so many Indian babies, when they need good food and exercise, the kicking and so on that a normal baby does get, are lying in an opium stupor.

I can't tonight illustrate the poverty of India but as a farmer in India trying to help the people of India, I have had to look into the causes of poverty, and I take it that the four chief causes of poverty lie within the religion of the majority of the people of India. I take it that the first of the four chief causes of India's poverty is caste—I can't speak of that tonight. The second is the relation to all animal life. Every animal must live. I remember one of our watchmen being bitten by a snake, and he died within an hour. I was on duty at the time and so I said to the water man, a Brahman, who gives water to drink to our students—he is the only man who can touch the bucket going to the well—"How do you know that a snake bit him?"

He said, "I saw the snake."

I said, "Did you kill it?"

He said. "If it was his fate to be bitten by a snake he would be bitten. I wouldn't kill a snake."

Third, their attitude toward women. Only one per cent of the

girls of India are literate. In all the castes women are kept behind walls. The death rate from tuberculosis is five girls and women to one man or boy. The doctors ascribe this fearful condition to the fact that the women are kept inside these insanitary dwellings and don't get out as the men and boys do in the sunlight and fresh air. Then the fourth is the great army of religious mendicants. Those also I cannot discuss tonight.

I see that fifteen hundred dollars is the average yearly expenditure for two thousand eight hundred American farm families. I could find you ten times that number of people in a given district in India where the average is something like thirty to fifty dollars for the yearly income.

Has America no concern for those poor people over there? Is she going to gather her skirts about her and say that because God has been good to her she is going to use it all selfishly for herself? I tell you if America does that in her pride and in her wealth I fear more for America than I do for India and Europe in their poverty. There was one who knew what he was talking about, he laid down eternal principles, and he said, "He that would lose shall save, and he that would save shall lose." And if America in her wealth says, "I am going to take all that I can get; and I am going to keep it for myself, and the rest of the world can go to the devil," I tell you I tremble for America.

# PART III

# REPORTS OF THE AMERICAN COUNTRY LIFE ASSOCIATION

# EXECUTIVE SECRETARY'S REPORT

*To the Members of the American Country Life Association:*

## ON THE HIGHWAY OF SELF-DISCOVERY

Those of you who have been thinking, breathing and living country life will agree that we have come a long way toward the light of a new day. On our way we have encountered obstacles such as prejudice; tradition; superiority complexes of our city friends; inferiority complexes of the country; sectarianism—social, religious, regional; materialism in its various forms; and we shall expect to continue to encounter them. On the other hand, we have met substantial encouragement in the variety of studies that have been made, and the advances in country life science. The lack of experience in approach is being met by a method of self-discovery and self-development which is being enriched by daily experience from within as well as without. Great movements and organizations with powerful resources are seriously considering the problem of country life as never before, each in their own field.

The rural community in all this process stands stoically by, challenging the variety of interests to get together in some synthetic program of rural social progress if these extra-community interests are going to submit a plan at all. The alternative is to find some method for it whereby it may discover itself and find ways and means of self-development with the extra-community reservoirs of resources "on tap," and, as we said at Columbus, "not on top." It is with this philosophic point of view in mind that our American Country Life Association during the past year has witnessed some glimpses of the possibility of helping the rural community.

## COLUMBUS AND ITS AFTERMATH

The topic of the conference, "Religion in Country Life," attracted nation-wide attention and received unusual publicity. Opinions

regarding the conference ran a wide gamut from those who "would have no more of such an insipid, flat, gushing, garrulous, one-man affair," to those who esteemed it the peak of a "great and profoundly religious gathering." Whatever we may think of the procedure, there were some definite scores made. The conference made its impact upon church boards, as reported by several of the board secretaries. Notable among these was the memorial submitted by the Methodist group to its Board of Bishops.

Local country life clubs are also partly the result of our Columbus gathering in which Washington, D. C., was the pioneer, Chicago following, and New York recently having joined the ranks. These local groups are made up of representatives in country life activities, educators, etc., who meet once a month during the fall and winter season for fellowship and discussion of vital topics.

### A RURAL STUDENT MOVEMENT

Two years ago, at St. Louis, the Collegiate Country Life Club of America was adopted by our Association as a factor in the future leadership of country life. About fifteen chapters are now registered in good standing. At Columbus, however, a group of students assembled including the representatives of Collegiate Country Life Clubs, which articulated a widespread feeling that something more should be done to bring the peculiar needs of students from rural communities at centers of learning to the attention of educational authorities, and to administrators of agencies who have it within their jurisdiction to utilize this tremendous latent power for our rural life.

### LEGISLATION

We were glad to make our contribution in crystallizing sentiment in favor of the Purnell bill as the result of an action of our Board of Directors and a special committee appointed therefor. Communications were sent to the Committees on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and of the Senate. Senator Wills, of Ohio, referred to our correspondence on the Senate floor. The passage of this bill is another milestone of country life.

### IS THERE A FARM WOMEN'S MOVEMENT?

This question has been engaging the attention of a special committee appointed by the Board of Directors in January, with representatives of government and farm organizations, and well-informed farm women, to ascertain what the present currents of thought and aspirations are of the rural womanhood of America. A number of protracted sessions of this committee have been held, and as the result of contacts of its members with hundreds of farm women the report of the committee's study is anticipated with much interest.

### RURAL EUROPEAN TRIP

Since it has been brought to our attention that representatives of America's rural life, in substantial numbers, are crossing the ocean and studying European rural conditions, an effort was made to discover what help if any we could be to these rural pilgrims. As a result an experiment is to be tried next summer during July and August, with the first party under the leadership of Dr. C. J. Galpin, of the United States Department of Agriculture. About fifty persons have already expressed an interest and some have made definite plans to make the trip. The party will visit Germany, Denmark and either England and Scotland or Ireland.

### A RURAL HAND BOOK

That we may be able to measure more accurately country life progress, a general demand for a summary of the situation, periodically, by authorities is about to be consummated in the publication of a *Hand Book of Rural Social Resources*. The work of editing is already in process. The book is to be ready for publication early in 1926. Part I will include statements by specialists on farmers' standards of living, movements among farm women, social work, religious organization, recreation, economic conditions, rural art movements, population trends, coöperative marketing, community organizations, agricultural organizations, education. Part II will contain a directory of National Agencies Engaged in Rural Social Work, with full descriptions of their programs. This has been made possible by a joint arrangement between the Research Department of the Federal Council of Churches and our Association.

### PUBLICATIONS

*Rural America,* appearing in its new dress and under its present title, has gained favor consistently. And our daily mail at the office reflects the impact which thirty thousand copies have made during the past year among our constituency. As the result of an urgent demand, with the coöperation of several of the leaders who were available in New York City and nearby, we compiled what is known as the Country Life Reading List, including about two hundred and fifty titles, which was published and the first edition of two thousand is already exhausted. A revised edition will be issued in the near future. Efforts are being made to bring the annual proceedings to a more practical use by publishing outline study courses based on these proceedings, which are having an increasing demand by rural clubs of various kinds. So far outline study courses have been published on "The Rural Home," and "Educating the Rural Community." The outline on "Religion in Country Life" is in preparation.

### THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF AGENCIES ENGAGED IN RURAL SOCIAL WORK

The National Council of Agencies Engaged in Rural Social Work has received our attention during the past year, particularly in compiling a restatement of the common purposes of these agencies in the rural field, including their objectives and programs in a more specific way than has previously been accomplished. This piece of work is nearing its completion and will be embodied in the *Hand Book of Rural Social Resources.* The splendid representation at a Council Meeting on Tuesday, October 27, 1925, is an evidence of the continued vital concerns of these agencies in certain issues which were discussed following up the work that was done at its meeting at Toronto, last year.

### FINANCES AND BUSINESS

The substantial support of the Russell Sage Foundation with one grant of $5,000 to publish *Rural America* and our conference proceedings, and another $5,000 to secure membership and a

financial constituency is a bulwark in our stressful financial career. Since last we met we have enlisted friends who found us $6,500 in new money. We express our sincere thanks and appreciation to the trustees of the Russell Sage Foundation for their confidence and substantial encouragement with their gifts and counsel. Furthermore, we are grateful to the host of new found friends as well as our old standbys who have been a source of inspiration to us.

In view of the numerous opportunities and unprecedented tasks, our Association now faces anew the problems of our present organization, structure, a policy of service and program, and that of financial support adequate to meet this situation. Our immediate concern is our financial budget for this year. Whereas we were successful in meeting the Russell Sage Foundation condition that we raise $25,000 last year, we did not cover our expenses for the year by a round sum of $3,500. According to the policy of our Board of Directors, which was adopted at its meeting early in January, we have pledged ourselves to close this year of 1925, the third with a full-time secretary, with all accounts paid. Six thousand dollars are needed for the balance of the year and $2,000 of unpaid pledges of last year must be met. In other words, a total of $8,000 must be secured by December 31.

It has been a busy year and therefore a most satisfactory year, filled with an abundance of satisfactions and inspiration and not without the necessary buffetings to keep us humble. Nevertheless, with the new day of country life at hand for ourselves and the nations of the world, how can we neglect so great a salvation?

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY ISRAEL,
*Executive Secretary.*

October, 1925.

# BUSINESS TRANSACTED DURING THE CONFERENCE

*Wednesday Afternoon.*

Mr. Israel, Executive Secretary, presented his prepared report, which is published on page 143.

It was voted that the report be received and filed.

The nominating committee, of which Professor A. Z. Mann was Chairman, presented the following report:

For President: Kenyon L. Butterfield
For Vice-President: L. J. Taber
For Second Vice-President: Mrs. Charles L. Schuttler
For Directors: Mabel Carney and Edmund de S. Brunner

It was voted that the Secretary be instructed to cast ballots for these officers and directors.

The nominating committee recommended an increase in the number of directors of the American Country Life Association.

It was voted that this matter be referred to the Board of Directors for consideration and such action as may be necessary.

Dr. Carl C. Taylor gave a short talk on membership in the Association and made an appeal for new members.

*Wednesday Evening.*

The Chairman of the Committee on Research, Dr. Carl C. Taylor, made a preliminary report of the status of rural social research, particularly in regard to the use of Purnell funds for research in rural economics and sociology.

It was voted to empower the president of the Association to appoint a committee of three to phrase a motion expressing the disappointment of the Association in regard to the small expenditure of Purnell Funds for social research, and to bring this to the attention of the Department of Agriculture.

The Chairman ruled that the motion be referred to the Board of Directors.

Mr. Nat T. France presented an appeal for funds for the support of the American Country Life Association.

*Thursday Evening.*

Professor Walter J. Campbell gave an address in regard to the finances of the Association and quotas for seventeen states were accepted for raising funds on the 1925 budget.

*Friday Morning.*

The Committee on the Farm Woman Movement presented resolutions which were referred to the Board of Directors.

The Committee on Resolutions presented formal expressions of thanks for coöperation and service to Mr. J. H. Montgomery, Dr. McConnell, the Coöperative Education League of Virginia, Mrs. Parker and Miss Parker, Professor Elliott, and the speakers and leaders who contributed to the conference. It was voted to adopt these resolutions.

Miss Ethel Nightingale of England was introduced and presented the greetings of the Women's Institutes of England.

# FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Following is a copy of the auditor's report of the financial position of the American Country Life Association as of December 31, 1925, and a statement of income and expenditure for the year 1925:

LYBRAND, ROSS BROS. & MONTGOMERY

March 1, 1926.

Dear Sirs:

In compliance with your request we have audited the books and accounts of the American Country Life Association for the year ended December 31, 1925, and we submit herewith a report of our examination together with a statement of income and expenditures for the year and the financial position of the Association as of December 31, 1925.

## BALANCE SHEET

December 31, 1925

| | |
|---|---|
| ASSETS: | |
| Cash in bank | $ 28.27 |
| Revolving fund | 750.00 |
| Books on hand, at cost | 2,808.28 |
| Accounts receivable | 1,250.00 |
| Office equipment | 726.18 |
| Total assets | $5,562.73 |
| LIABILITIES | |
| Accounts payable | $10,481.86 |
| Bank loans payable | 4,800.00 |
| Total liabilities | $15,281.86 |
| Total deficit 1925, carried over from 1923 and 1924 | 9,719.13 |
| | $ 5,562.73 |

## STATEMENT OF INCOME AND EXPENDITURES

for the year ended December 31, 1925

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| INCOME: | | |
| Membership: | | |
| Renewals | $ 2,072.00 | |
| New | 391.45 | |
| Affiliated | 155.00 | |
| Contributions: | | |
| Individual | 19,999.81 | |
| Foundation | 10,000.00 | |
| Bulletin subscriptions | 450.00 | |
| Book sales | 476.67 | |
| Miscellaneous income | 68.48 | |
| Total income | | $33,613.41 |
| EXPENDITURES: | | |
| Administration: | | |
| Salaries | $12,113.48 | |
| Rent, New York office | 1,285.41 | |
| Printing, stationery and postage | 812.75 | |
| Telephone and telegraph | 241.63 | |
| Traveling expense | 599.78 | |
| Committee service | 72.50 | |
| Interest on bank loans | 355.40 | |
| Depreciation on office equipment | 86.68 | |
| Miscellaneous expense | 226.68 | $15,794.31 |
| Membership and finance promotion: | | |
| Salaries | 3,752.96 | |
| Postage, addressing and mailing service | 5,267.05 | |
| Booklets, printed material, etc. | 444.25 | 9,464.26 |
| Rural America: | | |
| Editorial service | 700.00 | |
| Printing, typing, etc. | 2,968.46 | |
| Mailing, etc. | 225.20 | 3,893.66 |
| Conferences and convention | | 2,443.79 |
| Proceedings: | | |
| Printing and publishing | 1,652.18 | |
| On hand, January 1, 1925 | 2,773.14 | |
| | 4,425.32 | |
| Less, on hand, December 31, 1925 | 2,808.28 | 1,617.04 |
| | | $33,213.06 |
| Surplus for the year | | 400.35 |
| | | $33,613.41 |

# COMMITTEES OF THE ASSOCIATION

The permanent functioning factor of the American Country Life Association is its system of standing committees. It is the aim of the Association to have specialists appointed to these various committees who will devote attention and study to the subject matter with which each respective committee is concerned. The reports of these committees constitute a continuous critique of the social phases of American country life.

## I. Committee on Rural Government and Legislation

(To be appointed)

## II. Committee on Rural Organization

Chairman, Walter Burr, Kansas State Agricultural College, Manhattan, Kansas.
Charles J. Galpin, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Nat T. Frame, Director of Extension, Morgantown, W. Va.
E. L. Morgan, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Edwin C. Johnson, Dean of Agricultural College, Pullman, Wash.
Elwood Mead, Department of Interior, Washington, D. C.
Dwight Sanderson, Rural Social Organization, Ithaca, N. Y.

## III. Committee on Country Planning

Chairman, Frank A. Waugh, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Amherst, Mass.
John W. Gregg, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.
Arthur W. Cowell, Department of Horticulture, State College, Pa.
George B. Dealey, Manager, "Dallas News," Dallas, Texas.

## IV. Committee on Teaching of Rural Sociology

Chairman, John H. Kolb, Department of Economics, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.
George H. von Tungeln, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
Miss Rosamond Root, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
H. A. Bone, Illinois State Normal University, Normal, Ill.
E. S. Bogardus, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.

## V. Committee on Recreation and Social Life

Chairman, A. G. Arvold, State College of Agriculture, Fargo, N. D.

### VI. COMMITTEE ON RELIGIOUS LIFE AND ACTIVITIES

Chairman (To be appointed)
Edwin L. Earp, Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
R. A. McGowan, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.
R. A. Adams, Rural Church Field Worker, Lansdale, Pa.
C. M. McConnell, Board of Home Missions and Church Extension, Methodist Episcopal Church, 740 Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois.
Warren H. Wilson, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
A. W. Taylor, 821 Occidental Building, Indianapolis, Indiana.
Edwin V. O'Hara, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Eugene, Oregon.
Albert E. Roberts, National Y. M. C. A., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Miss Anna M. Clark, National Y. W. C. A., 600 Lexington Ave., New York, N. Y.
Malcolm Dana, 287 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
M. R. Zigler, Home Mission Secretary Church of the Brethren, 3435 Van Buren St., Chicago, Illinois.
Theodore B. Manny, Hendrix College, Conway, Arkansas.
Edmund de S. Brunner, Institute of Social and Religious Research, 370 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y.

### VII. COMMITTEE ON RURAL SOCIAL WORK

Chairman, Leroy A. Ramsdell, New York School of Social Work, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Henrietta Roelofs, National Board Y. W. C. A., 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Mr. Wiley Swift, National Child Labor Committee, 215 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Miss Emma Lundburg, Child Welfare League of America, 130 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Elizabeth Rogers, 262 Ann Street, Hartford, Conn.
Miss Margaret Sickels, Central Bureau of Social Service, Morristown, N. J.
Miss Gertrude Vaile, Box 220, Hartsdale, N. Y.
Mr. Burr Blackburn, Georgia State Council of Social Agencies, Atlanta, Ga.
Miss Louise Cottrell, Extension Service, Iowa State University, Iowa City, Iowa.
Mr. J. H. Montgomery, Coöperative Education League of Virginia, Richmond, Va.
Mr. J. B. Gwin, American Red Cross, Washington, D. C.
Miss Elizabeth Alling, 140 Benedict Avenue, Norwalk, Ohio.

*State Representatives:*

Mrs. Grace Cary, 2 Myrtle Street, Hartford, Conn.
Miss Mary Helen Smith, State Charities Aid Association, 105 East 22nd Street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Mame Camp, Carolina State Board of Public Welfare, Raleigh, N. C.
Mr. H. J. Mathews, State Board of Public Welfare, Atlanta, Ga.
Miss Hannah Protzman, 277 East Long Street, Columbus, Ohio.
Miss Evadne Laptad, 1732 Louisiana Street, Lawrence, Kansas.

### VIII. COMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND TRANSPORTATION

Chairman, George H. von Tungeln, Iowa State College, Ames, Ia.
E. L. Kirkpatrick, Farm Population and Rural Life Section, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
John Phelan, Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
W. E. Garnett, State College of Texas, College Station, Texas.
Mrs. Charles C. Schuttler, Farmington, Mo.
E. S. Bogardus, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Cal.
Miss Florence E. Ward, States Relation Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Hermann N. Morse, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Henry A. Wallace, "Wallace's Farmer," Des Moines, Ia.
F. C. Horner, General Motors Corporation, 224 West 57th St., New York, N. Y.
R. E. Plimpton, "Bus Transportation," 10th Avenue and 36th Street, New York, N. Y.

### IX. COMMITTEE ON RURAL LEADERSHIP TRAINING

Chairman, W. J. Campbell, Y. M. C. A. College, Springfield, Mass.
John Phelan, Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
Ernest Burnham, State Normal College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
G. Walter Fiske, 278 West College Street, Oberlin, O.
Miss Anna M. Clark, National Y. W. C. A., 600 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y.
Earl A. Roadman, Department of Rural Leadership, Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Ia.
A. W. Nolan, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
John H. Kolb, Department of Economics, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.

### X. COMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATION OF RURAL SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Chairman, Carl C. Taylor, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N. C.
Hermann N. Morse, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.
C. J. Galpin, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Warren H. Wilson, Presbyterian Board of National Missions, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

### XI. COMMITTEE ON RURAL EDUCATION

Chairman, Ernest Burnham, State Normal College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
O. G. Brim, State University, Columbus, O.
Miss Fannie W. Dunn, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.
Miss Elizabeth Kelley, Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, N. C.
N. R. Baker, Superintendent of Jefferson County Public Schools, Birmingham, Ala.
Will C. Wood, Superintendent of Education, Sacramento, Cal.
Miss June Emery, Dean of State Normal School, Madison, S. D.
Mrs. Katherine M. Cook, Chief of Division of Rural Education, Federal Bureau of Education, Washington, D. C.
George C. Works, Department of Rural Education, State College of Agriculture, Ithaca, N. Y.
Miss Josephine A. Arnquist, State College of Agriculture, Ames, Ia.
John H. Kolb, Department of Economics, College of Agriculture, Madison, Wis.

### XII. COMMITTEE ON HEALTH AND SANITATION

(To be appointed)

### XIII. COMMITTEE ON HOMEMAKING

Chairman, Miss Ilena M. Bailey, Bureau of Home Economics, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Miss Lita Bane, Secretary American Home Economics Association, Washington, D. C.
Miss Grace E. Frysinger, Coöperative Extension Work, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.
Miss Amelia Greenwald, Council of Jewish Women, 132 East 45th Street, New York, N. Y.
Miss Bess Rowe, "The Farmer's Wife," St. Paul, Minn.
Mrs. Jane S. McKimmon, State Home Demonstration Agent, Raleigh, N. C.
Miss Harriet Mason, "The Ohio Farmer," Cleveland, O.
Miss Ola Powell, Office of Coöperative Extension Work, U. S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

### XIV. COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL ASPECTS OF COUNTRY LIFE

Chairman, Kenyon L. Butterfield, Michigan Agricultural College, East Lansing, Mich.
J. R. Howard, 30 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. C. Lindeman, Greystone, High Bridge, N. J.
Thomas F. Hunt, Berkeley, Cal.
Mrs. Robert A. Ware, 246 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.
E. C. Branson, Chapel Hill, N. C.

# INDEX


Agricultural outlook, 32
Analysis of the Conference, 90-102
Attitude of city towards farmer, 80

Bailey, Dr. Liberty Hyde, 28
Balanced standards of life, 38
Bomberger, F. B., 14
Burley Association, The, 52
Butterfield, Kenyon L., 3, 111

Canadian farm life, 128-131
Church leadership, 38
Collegiate country life clubs, 106
Community agencies, adjustment of, 80
Community consciousness, 41, 46, 84
  adjustments needed, 66
  organization, 84
  relations of coöperatives, 53
Conference analysis, 90-102
  criticism, 87, 91
  plan of, 4-8
  suggestions, 92
Cook, Katherine M., 42
Coöperative leadership, 83
  marketing, 19, 51, 64, 83
    associations, 30
Coöperatives, adjustments needed, 63
  community relations of, 53
  distinctive contributions of, 53
  leadership needed, 65
  their influence, 48
Cotton production, 28
Country life clubs, 144
    integrating, 79
Country Life Reading List, 146
County Council in Virginia, 44
Crop mortgages, 26

Dana, Dr. Malcolm, 3, 69
Danish farm economics, 29
Denominational loyalties, 76
Denune, Perry P., 20, 43
Developing local tastes and desires, 39
Direct education in economic relationships, 55
Douglass, Dr. H. Paul, 15

Economic coöperation, 48
Education, 85
  elementary, 71, 73, 84
  in economic relationships, 21
  vocational, 70
Educators and coöperatives, 50
Efficiency on the farm, 20
Elements in farmer's standard of living, 56
Elliott, Harrison, 4, 10, 14, 18, 36, 44, 46
England's rural problems, 31
European trip, 145
Extension service, 41

Family incomes, 12
Farm efficiency, 20
  overproduction, 13
  women's movement, 145
Farmers' incomes, 10-23, 78
    analysis of, 60
  standard of living, 36, 56
France, Nat T., 149
Frysinger, Miss Grace, 68

Garnett, Dr. W. E., 11, 14, 19
Green, R. W., 53

Hail insurance, 26
*Handbook of Rural Social Resources*, 145
Harlan, Prof. R., 17
Higginbottom, Sam, 136
Home Missions Council, 77
Howell, A. E., 38, 67
Hutcheson, John R., 50

Income, family, 12
  of farmers, 10-23, 78
Incomes, analysis of, 60
  how to increase, 24
Insurance, livestock and hail, 26
Integrating country life, 79

Kalamazoo students' report, 106
Kelley, Miss Elizabeth, 48, 57, 74
Kendrick, W. H., 20

Kirkpatrick, Dr. E. L., 12, 15, 40, 56
Kitchin, Mrs. W. J., 103

Labor income of farmer, 16
Landis, B. Y., 39, 53, 63
Larger parish plan, 69
Lindeman, E. C., 52, 68, 86, 89
Livestock insurance, 26
Local tastes and desires, development of, 40

Maladjustments of rural life, 3
McConnell, Dr. J. P., 51
Methods of increasing farmers' incomes, 18
Meyers, Prof. C. E., 73
Montgomery, J. H., 44
Morehead, Mrs. Clyde, 21
Mumford, Dr., 75

Nelson, Rev. Robert B., 76
Newton, Bruce L., 16
Nightingale, Miss Ethel, 149
Nourse, Dr. E. G., 32

Occupational consciousness, development of, 66
Odum, Howard W., 117
O'Hara, E. V., 132
Organized religion, 75, 85
Overproduction on farms, 13, 28

Plan of the Conference, 4-8
Poe, Dr. Clarence, 25
Political adjustments, 80
Publications, 146
Purnell bill, 144

Ramsdell, L. A., 12, 61
Relation of farm groups to other groups, 79
Religion, organized, 75, 85
Reynolds, Dr. J. B., 66, 128
Roelofs, Miss H., 13
*Rural America*, 146
Rural and urban relationships, 115
church leadership, 38
European trip, 145
life, maladjustments of, 3
problems in England, 31
student movement, 144

School taxes, 39
Schuttler, Mrs. Charles, 13
Smith-Hughes Act, 70, 85
Smith-Lever Act, 71, 85
Social adaptation, 120
sciences, 118
Springfield Y. M. C. A. College, 106
Standard of living, elements in, 56
Standards of life, 79
Suggestions as to procedure, 8
Syracuse University, 106

Taylor, Dr. Carl C., 13, 48, 55, 65, 74, 123, 148
Tipton, Mary C., 52
True, Dr. A. C., 41, 51, 74

United Farmers Organization, 130
Urban and rural relationship, 115
attitudes, 80

Virginia, County Council in, 44
Vocational education, 70

Weller, Miss W. L., 21
Woods, Clarence, 20

Date Due

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

58048

WITHDRAWN

T2-DFV-796